

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

A £2000 fine & 200 hrs of community service. They know what they are doing.

A few years ago I was nearly caught up in a wild fire in the Forest which was possibly either as a result of a camping fire or a barbecue. I do feel that public safety is a matter of great concern regarding fires in the Forest but even more worrying is the loss of wildlife and wildlife habitats. I agree that controlled burning is necessary but feel that the wild fires should be taken into consideration when planning controlled burning (if they are not already). We have lost so much wildlife from the Forest in my lifetime that I feel numerous measures should be taken including this one.

A fixed penalty of a paltry amount of £100 is NOT a deterrent. Also, the maximum penalty fine should be increased to at least £2,500. An uncontrolled fire can be devastating to many hectares of land as has been seen in many cases over recent years across the country. With a significant increase in day visitors likely, due to 'staycations' and the cost of living crisis, anti-social behaviour is likely to increase exponentially. This is also likely to lead to a significant increase in wild camping.

A sensible way forward to protect the Forest

A timely proposal given the likely increase in hotter summers and resultant higher fire risk.

Absolutely 100% agree that the this should go ahead, living local to the new forest, the distress and decimation to the flora and fauna and wildlife...plus people's homes would be devastating on many levels

Absolutely agree with this, but how can you possibly stop people doing this in areas which are not monitored?

Agreed fully

and participate regularly in wildlife surveys in the NF. Although I am responding in a private capacity,

I strongly support these proposals.

An even greater threat to the forest are the flame filled chinese paper "sky lanterns", I have seen 30 or so of these released from a car park party near Fritham on a summers day! Not only do they pose a severe fire threat but the wire structure can also damage livestock wherever it lands.They should be banned.

Any legislation must be backed up by taking action if these laws are broken.

Anything that causes danger to wildlife in the New Forest can only be dealt with by legislation. Notices are completely ignored.

I am extremely concerned about the likelihood of a heath fire causing terrible damage and danger to animals including the wildlife. With ancient woodland no longer cleared the Forest floor is strewn with timber that would effectively act like a bonfire and might prove very difficult to extinguish. The effects would be devastating to the ecology of the area and I am not sure that we have sufficient experienced firefighters or equipment to cope with large heath fires. With the extreme temperatures that we experienced last year more likely due to climate change we cannot afford to risk fires within The New Forest and I don't think it is much to ask people to refrain from having BBQs within the restricted area to ensure the beauty of The Forest stays as safe as possible.

As a resident I am saddened to hear of the destruction/danger to our wildlife caused by ignorant/inconsiderate visitors to the forest by the use of BBQs/fires. I think the time has come for much more severe penalties to be imposed on those that refuse to follow the rules that are so clearly signposted.

I have seen debris and remains of BBQs and fires, including fireworks, and the damage caused by these activities. I strongly agree that there should be every possible measure put into place to discourage and stop them.

As long as this does not impact either Forestry or Privately run campsites where the use of BBQ's and Gas stoves is controlled already, by means of being off the ground or using specialist fire pits

As mentioned the Hale Area and in particular Hale Park should be included as while it is largely private land public activities (camping) is allowed and BBQs and Fire pits are a real threat to surrounding woods and property

As we border the Forest Area we are concerned about the spread of any fire and its effects on us and the Forest as a whole.

As with any legislation, enforcement is an issue where authorised personel are thin on the ground. Good publicity is key to the successful prevention of breaches.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

As you will see from my preceding answers, I share all the concerns about wildfires and the very serious risk posed by BBQs and campfires in the forest. It is therefore with considerable reluctance that I have voted NO to the use of PSPOs. I have done so simply because I do not believe that PSPOs are either the correct or suitable legal solution. Moreover, I think they represent a very shoddy tool in the legal toolbox and the literature highlights a host of poor practice to support that view. As councillors will be aware, the power to make PSPOs stems from legislation in 2014 to tackle Anti-Social Behaviour. It was designed to tackle activities occurring in public places which were deemed to have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality. In itself, that is already an unusually subjective aim for any form of enforcement. Commentators at the time referred to the "unprecedented breadth" of the new powers which in effect "allowed councils to create crimes". The lack of clarity around what qualifies as having a detrimental effect on quality of life opens up the undesirable prospect of including things simply on the basis of taste and yet still criminalising such behaviour. None of this sounds like good practice to me. In the early years, initial uses appeared to remain close to the assumed ASB-tackling intent. Typical applications were associated with nuisances from noise, alcohol or substance use, dogs and intimidating activity such as aggressive begging and nearly always in an urban setting. Over time, however, a degree of scope creep has seen PSPOs used for ever wider purposes often being used as a quick fix means to avoid using or amending existing proper legal process (eg formally sanctioned byelaws) which could and should have been used to deal with anything that is considered criminal activity. This trend has been encouraged by weak (or non-existent) oversight by the Home Office leading to various high profile cases of inappropriate application. In the worst cases, councils stand accused of outsourcing policing by authorising private security contractors to issue on-the-spot fines, followed by prosecution in a magistrates court for something that isn't a crime (under criminal law) even in cases where it is only determined that a contravention may have occurred (not where one has definitely taken place). Is that really a public space model that we want to participate in? I would ask that councillors consider very carefully whether this rather murky legal area is really a road they want to go down and, if it is, whether they fully understand and are prepared for the minefield of application, interpretation and lobbying that is likely to follow. If the wildfire problem needs tackling, let's use (or fix) the correct legal mechanisms rather than shoehorn the aims into a piece of ill-conceived and poorly implemented pseudo-law that, in any event, was always aimed at a rather different set of circumstances than we are facing.

Ban BBQs and open fires on the New Forest heath and beaches

Ban it as no one reads signs or bylaws

Ban the use of BBQs and fires in entirety.

BBQ's and open fires encourage large parties of people to gather in close proximity to the car parks. People then try and feed the forest stock ponies and cattle with inappropriate food Debris is left behind, plastic , metal tins etc. which is extremely dangerous to the wild life.

BBQ's are lit by people who have not considered/don't care/don't realise the dangers of their actions. My concern is who is going to police the New Forest? Is the publicity to raise the dangers of fires enough?

BBQs ought to be restricted to areas suitable, such as raised, brick built, grass areas, like at Fordingbridge recreation ground, where should accidental fire be caused, they are easily managed and don't pose threat to ecology

Campsites marked in red are excluded, but what about other campsites such as the Scout site at Wilverley Cottage? I also wonder how effective the order will be (i.e. the ability to enforce it) in comparison to the education of visitors already being taken.

Chinese lanterns and fireworks should also have been included in the PSPO

Clarification that the PSPO does not apply to private dwellings within the area could be made clearer within the draft.

Consider changing the rules at the current new forest campsites i.e. Holmsley

Controlled burning of the gorse should still be allowed.

Could the lighting of fireworks be included

Despite several attempts to mitigate wildfire issues via the implementation of campaigns and a ban on disposable BBQs on Forestry land in 2020, the problem of wildfires does seem to be a continual growing risk in rural areas. The recreational demands on the lands are likely to remain consistent and this poses an issue regarding the levels of fires in the future. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the proposed PSPO is needed, particularly regarding in terms of cost and resources available in terms of tackling these wildfires. The severity and frequency of the wildfires highlighted is linked to BBQs and fires of a similar nature, of which are most popular during the hottest, driest times of the year, thus the PSPO seems a reasonable suggestion to reduce these incidences from occurring and acting as a deterrent. Having designated Forestry England Campsites will hopefully offer the same amenities for the public without the same level of risk of wildfires.

Despite the coverage of how dangerous lighting fires is in the New Forest some of my local shops still stock portable BBQs and I keep reminding them of the need to cease doing this. So I think this is a really important step to stop people using them.

Disposable BBQs should be banned, they are dangerous and produce huge amounts of heat & take hours to cool down, which means the user does not take them home or dispose of them correctly

Do you intend to provide many more purpose built BBQ sites that will be easily booked for use by the public? This would help reduce the risk of portable BBQs etc.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

Dropped cigarettes are just as much of a danger as BBQs. Someone chucked a still lit butt out of a car at the top of my track a few years ago, and the gorse went up. It was brought under control, but it was very scary.
Duration should be indefinite, subject to review every two years
██████████ have asked me to seek clarification that bonfires on East Boldre allotments will not fall under this PSPO. The allotment site is rented from FE. The Draft PSPO point 1 (legitimate land management activities undertaken by those with a legal interest in the Restricted Area or their authorised agents) implies that allotments are excluded - we seek confirmation that our interpretation is correct, since well managed bonfires are essential to allotment practice and management. Notwithstanding, ██████████ requires all plot holders to comply with FE bans during high risk dry periods and will continue to rely on FE guidance. We hope that such guidance will continue once the PSPO is in place.
Enforcement will be an issue. I walk in the Forest on a regular basis and very seldom do I encounter any official who would be able to enforce this Order. Perhaps trained volunteer "eyes" are required to assist in observing offences and advising officers. Perhaps a rota of volunteers stationed at carparks at busy times would give some visibility of enforcement measures. Perhaps this can be raised at the forthcoming ██████████. Publicity and notices are not sufficiently prominent --- those that are at Car Parks are invariably faded and unreadable.
Enforcement will be key, funding is needed for more rangers.
Enforcement will be key. Will clear signage be erected? How would members of the public report the use of BBQs in the restricted area? It's a common occurrence during summer months in the car parks and off the paths.
Ensure the end of prohibited order is reviewed after 3 years and extended.
Especially with the extreme temperatures we have had in the summers lately banning the lighting of fires/BBQ etc except by the forestry commission for land management should be prohibited. It should also be prohibited on Testwood lakes Calmore where there was a fire last Summer.
Excellent and practical measure.
Expand the areas to include Frogham!!!
Feel this is great idea.
Fire is one of the most dangerous natural events
Fires are a low probability but very high risk threat. Clarity of the law and consistency of approach is required to counter.
Fires are not only dangerous but are generally antisocial. The regular lighting of smelly bonfires and old fashioned chimney fires in Fordingbridge is a constant nuisance. I would be quite happy for NFDC to ban all open fires throughout the district, including those in private property. At the very least there should be a requirement for smokeless fuel in built up areas. As regards the forest I have seen numerous barbecues and open fires during the past few years. Some of these were in plain view in popular visitor spots and next to roads, others were away from the roads and car parks. This appeared to increase as the number of visitors increased during summer of 2020 and 2021. This large increase of visitors was presumably due to the covid panic and the restrictions on foreign travel. It is possible that we will see a reduction in the next few years as those restrictions decrease. ██████████ and have witnessed the devastating results of wild fires there and more recently in Wareham forest. I completely agree with the proposed order to ban fires but there are some problems that need to be addressed. Enforcement - who will enforce the rules? The majority of current incidents go unchallenged so why would you believe that there will be more challenges in future. Some fires at night are clearly visible but nothing seems to be done about them eg. regular fires at Castle Hill beauty spot. There will not be any extra police officers. Forest rangers or other NPA employees will require additional training in handling conflict, use of discretion, enforcement procedures, evidence gathering and court procedures. I hope that private security is not engaged as the level of SIA training falls far short of what is required. Police are meant to practice the Four Es "engage, explain, encourage, enforce". The issue of penalty notices should be the last resort for more minor events. Unfortunately even among those who are highly trained in law enforcement there are some who are overzealous. There is also a tendency to go after the easy targets rather than those more likely to cause conflict. Both over and under reactions cause reputational damage and a lack of respect from the public. More signs will need to be erected to include the fact that lighting fires is not only forbidden but also subject to penalty. These will have to be on every road, every car park and every layby. We already have far too many signs! The area - I am surprised that the solent shore at Keyhaven and Lymington is not included. I have often seen the remains of barbecues and fireworks along that shore. On one of your published maps you appear to exclude areas like Penn common, Cadnam common and the area between Hyde and Frogham. These are exactly the kind of place where people light fires. You also exclude private land within the forest. The problem is that someone could light a bonfire or barbecue on adjacent private land and it could go out of control and create a massive forest fire, for which there would be no penalty. Meanwhile someone dropping a cigarette in a car park could be penalised. The Draft - It is unclear as to whether or not the order will apply to people inside their own vehicle. Your draft does not mention "open to the air" although that phrase is used in your background information. Do you intend to stop the use of fixed gas stoves within motorhomes (impossible to enforce)? What about someone stopping for a cigarette in a layby or car park, either in or out of their vehicle? What about someone inside a tent? The prohibition of "(c) using items which either (i) cause a naked flame or (ii) pose a risk of fire" criminalises all use of naked flames so on the face of it someone could be penalised for lighting a cigarette. At the same time the second part of that provision is very vague and could probably be challenged on the grounds that it is too subjective and not clear enough. I think that the word "launching" should be applied to the activities section. Chinese lanterns, for example, are not placed, dropped or thrown. They are launched.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

<p>Fires are too dangerous a real risk to life of human and animals it's simply not worth the risk in a climate crisis. BBQs must be banned completely and Fireworks don't forget those things leave toxic litter and can easily start fires.</p>
<p>For any order of this type to be effective, it will be crucially important that is comprehensively explained and publicised to the general public and rigorously enforced. Between them, I would expect the key agencies involved (NFDC, The NFNPA and Forestry England etc) to be able to manage the publicity - but I would have no faith whatsoever in their ability to subsequently enforce it. If a pertinent example is needed, you have only to think of the great job that they currently do in catching and prosecuting fly tippers in the New Forest!</p>
<p>Forest fires are my main concern during the very dry months. I see many scorch marks during the summer where fires have been lit or the BBQ and litter has just been left at the scene. I strongly believe these people should be fined. I also think there should be more signs in car parks and entrances to the forest with warnings before fines are issued. It should also be compulsory for hotels and campsites to have literature handed to visitors so they are aware of the ban and fines. I hope this goes ahead</p>
<p>Forestry England has been working closely with New Forest District Council and our other partners across the New Forest to look at ways to enhance the care of this special place. The Recreation Management Strategy for the New Forest, supported by the steering group organisations, advisory group and the public through previous consultations, sets out a series of measures and objectives to ensure that this special place is both protected and provides access for all to enjoy the benefits of spending time here. We see the proposed PSPOs as an essential tool in supporting the work of this strategy. Protecting the New Forest from the growing risk of wildfires and their potentially devastating consequences is a key priority. It has been an issue for some time and, despite concerted effort with our campaign to ban fires/barbecues, our teams have spent many hours in recent years preventing irresponsible use and working with the emergency services to respond to incidents. The risks of wildfire are considerable and increasing. The damage they can cause was demonstrated in 2020 when a large part of the land we manage at Wareham Forest was destroyed in a fire caused by disposable barbeques. Taking all necessary measures to prevent a similar incident from occurring in the New Forest is critical and we fully support the introduction of a PSPO in this area as a further safeguard and key way to communicate the risks to those spending time here. We are committed to working with New Forest District Council and other partner organisations in the New Forest to support the roll out of the PSPOs if they are enacted.</p>
<p>Forestry England seem to be very reluctant to enforce any of the current byelaws. I hope they can be persuaded to change their attitude.</p>
<p>From a public access perspective we must encourage responsible access for all. It is imperative that efforts to educate the public come first and the PSPO is only used as a last resort. Perhaps signage making the public aware of the PSPO could include a QR code leading to a simple explanation of this need. On the restricted area there are possible areas of confusion for the public. As one example I include a screen shot of the map of the area to the SW of the C17 road (running NW to SE) is not FE land but there is no boundary to show this, and most would be unaware of it. How will this be dealt with? I would not want to delay the implementation of this PSPO as it represents a significant step forward, but perhaps this is a matter for future iterations?</p>
<p>Given the changing climate we obviously have a much more serious problem than in the past. It seems common sense to have these proposal in place as law and strongly educated and reinforced to the public. Otherwise, eventually there is going to be a serious fire with risk to everyone and everything....</p>
<p>[REDACTED]. The protection of the forest's biodiversity, and the safety of the community, means that everyone can enjoy the Forest, whether they live here, work here, or visit here in a way that's responsible, and in a way that preserves it for the future. Wildfires are a serious danger to the public and can cause devastation to the wildlife and fauna of our unique and wonderful destination. Most members of the public respect the sensitive landscape of the forest, and it is important that as part of the process, clear signage is in place, and improved where necessary, to include entry points to the Forest where a PSPO is in force. Guidance and education must always be a priority in preventing, or addressing, any act or behaviour which is detrimental to the natural landscape or wildlife of the New Forest or a danger to the public. It is clear from the evidence put forward that some members of the public still blatantly disregard notices and warnings of the dangers of wildfire and if such guidance is ignored, then it is vital that steps can be taken to prevent the possible devastation and harm which could be caused.</p>
<p>[REDACTED] would like the Council to consider the banning of sky lanterns and fireworks in the restricted area too as these are hazard to both the ecology and the animals.</p>
<p>Great idea but until ALL the shops stop selling BBQs this problem will continue. Local people understand this issue but people from outside the forest do not understand</p>
<p>Great idea which should be approved and enforced.</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

██████████ would strongly suggest that the area proposed in PSPO1 includes the village of Hale and also Hale Purlieu which are omitted from the restricted area in this draft. Hale Purlieu is a very important site, an SSSI and a Ramsar site and therefore receives many visitors. The area can be accessed by the car parks at Hale Purlieu (National Trust) and Turf Hill and therefore is very vulnerable to visitors who may be planning have a BBQ or light a fire. The area of Hatchet Green within the village of Hale is common land and therefore a place visited by many people; it is also an SSSI. This area can be accessed by the car park at the village hall and is therefore vulnerable to visitors possibly lighting fires and having BBQ's. ██████████ strongly believe that both these areas of Hale should be included in the restricted area with the boundary for the PSPO1 being Hale Road (From Hale to Woodgreen). This area is of equal importance to the rest of the New Forest and therefore should receive equal protection.

██████████ also like to add that the current draft of PSPO1 prohibits any type of naked flame and therefore would include a small portable stove or Trangia that may be used by a walker, particularly during the winter months.

Having seen the damage from wildfires in Dorset, Australia and California it is essential to protect local habitat and to protect the lives and property of residents

Hope it gets passed.

██████████ supports this proposal.

How will this affect controlled burning by forestry management?

How will this be enforced? NFDC must resource this enforcement. Is it right to presume any fines will be used to keep enforcement costs down?

How will you police it and who is going to pay for it.

I absolutely agree that fires and barbecues should not be allowed in these areas.

I agree but they won't be enforced. The under resourced police can't deal with their own work and the council employees will be too weak to enforce them.

I agree to disposable barbecues, but to cooking equipment in general I believe should only be restricted certain times of the year. When on a long hike access to hot food and drinks is important, particularly in the winter. The problem with disposable barbecues is the ability to place on the grass directly. Official cooking stoves are designed with fire safety in mind.

I agree with the order, the problem will be enforcing it. In the summer we regularly see people with BBQ at testwood lakes or in the forest

██████████ in the New Forest and we are always educating people on the dangers of BBQ's, Open Fires and other ignition sources during the dry summer months when out on patrols or at fixed events. The majority of people accept the advice and put out the fire or BBQ but there are those few individuals that think they know best and continue with the behaviour. Having the option of a PSPO as a last resort to try and modify the behaviour of persistent offenders is a good tool to have. It mentions in the consultation paper that a constable or other officer appointed by the local authority would be able to issue these. To be effective people patrolling the New Forest need to be able to issue these. I would not suggest Volunteer Rangers but the full time FE and NPA Rangers as well as the FE Keepers and Agisters should also have the ability to issue a PSPO.

██████████ I spent many hours fighting fires in the New Forest, most of which were unnecessary and had been started either accidentally and occasionally deliberately. The accidents were usually found to be caused by thrown-away cigarettes, B.B.Qs or other temporary open fires. We have a beautiful Forest which should be protected at all costs.

I am concerned that enforcement will not be practical or achievable given the limited resources available.

I am concerned that it will not be policed and that people wishing to have BBQs/fires will just go deeper into the forest potentially causing more damage

I am of the opinion that regulation is, generally, less effective than encouragement. I believe that provision of safe barbecue areas where people can use their own, or provided, barbecues would encourage them to use these areas and that this would lead to a drop in the use of barbecue in open land. Give people an easy option and they will usually take it. It is ironic that controlled areas for barbecue have recently been removed!

██████████ remember the devastation caused by wildfires in the forest in 1976 and we all want to try to avoid such a situation again to such a valuable part of natural England. It is not just the immediate effect of the fire but it takes years for the ecology to recover. Further as much as we do not like notice boards there should be educational displays at all the entrances advising visitors of the extreme dangers of fire in the New Forest.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

I am puzzled by the fact that the 'New Forest Public Spaces Protection Order 2022' (Nos 1 & 2) will be enacted by the New Forest District Council to cover areas which lie within the New Forest National Park. Why is it that the NFNPA are not solely dealing with this, without the involvement of NFDC? As the areas involved are all within the New Forest National Park, it is surely down to the NFNPA to administer, police and enforce the restrictions of lighting outdoor fires, and the feeding and petting of New Forest ponies, horses, donkeys, etc. The restrictions in the Orders are solely for the protection of the New Forest National Park Authority's landscape and animals so, understandably, it is not relevant for the areas of the NFDC which lie outside of the national park. I fully support the objectives of the Public Space Protection Orders, but the main omission is that the maps accompanying the Orders, exclude the areas of the NFNPA that occur within Test Valley District Council, namely, Plaitford Common and Canada Common. This is because they fall outside of the NFDC area but they fall within the New Forest Perambulation boundary. So it would seem that the restrictions imposed by the Public Spaces Protection Orders will not apply or be enforceable in these TVDC areas. The reality of these restrictions is that the recently approved Green Hill Holiday Village on Landford Common can allow the daily 900 or so holidaymakers, who will be staying at the holiday lodges during spring/summer/autumn months, to use the direct access gate to Plaitford Common and beyond, where they will be able to light fires, have barbeques, feed and pet ponies, horses and donkeys, without any fear of fines or prosecution. This will also give them the mistaken assumption that these activities are permitted anywhere in the national park. Or will TVDC be creating their own Public Space Protection Orders to cover their areas which lie within the New Forest Perambulation boundary?

We note that Beaulieu and the surrounding area are not included in the restricted area for proposal 1 (the lightening of fires) but is for proposal 2 (restriction of the feeding of animals). We understand that Beaulieu Estate is privately owned but the inclusion of the land on the estate for proposal 2 suggest that Beaulieu has purposely been left out of proposal 1. The Estate supports commercial activities which encourages the lightening of fires either on camp or caravan sites (BBQs) or as part of bush craft activities which are run on the estate (eg New Forest Activities). We have seen advertised bush crafts and the lightening of fires which is not compatible with the protection of the New Forest. Moreover it encourages some to think the lightening of fires in the National Park as part of bush craft activities is an acceptable activity. This is particular worrying in woody areas which contained residents' houses (eg Hartford Wood) where such activities take place. It is all the more dangerous as the woods have a peat base. Some of our residents remember a bad fires in Hartford Wood in the late 1970s. We have frequently complained about fire lightening activities to the estate and the the NFNPA. We agree with Proposal 1 and like to see it extended to cover the Beaulieu and its surrounding area.

I am suprised we haven't had a major fire in the Forest.

I applaud the NFDC for taking this step, it is the only effective way to stop or at least reduce the risk of a major and catastrophic fire in the New Forest National Park

I assume private houses within the restricted area will be exempt (in my case I live in Burley which is surrounded by restricted area but not restricted itself)

I assume, in addition to the permitted use of raised stoves within designated campsites, occupants of camper vans would also be allowed to use a stove within their van in a designated car park

I believe it is essential that this PSPO should be approved and that consideration should be given to additional PSPOs to safeguard the New Forest.

I believe it is vital to protect all aspects of the Forest flora, fauna and grazing livestock. But it must also be enforced.

I believe that disposable barbecues should be banned in all the forest and on the beaches.

I believe the area covered by proposed PSPO No 1 should include the areas around Beaulieu which appear to have been excluded? The extensive woodland that the public have access to is very vulnerable to fire risk in the Beaulieu area and therefore the boundary of the restricted area should be revised to include this area.

I believe we need this PSPO, before we have a major fire in the Forest

I can see that identifying who has acted illegally within a group may be problematic for any enforcement officer and you may need to tighten up guidelines on that. Do you fine everybody in a group, and how do you deal with the under-aged? I'm normally mildly against the curtailment of civil liberties, but in the modern age common sense seems to have abandoned many. Thus, I must conclude that due to the potential seriousness of fires getting out of control could have far reaching consequences in the wider landscape.

I congratulate you in being proactive on this issue. Having seen the immense damage done in nearby Wareham Forest which made the national news I think the sooner this is put in place the better

I do not object to the planned use of fire between January and March to prevent worse fires in summer and to enhance the grazing by the addition of the resultant potash.

I do not think the imposition of fines is the way forward, as it could be detrimental to the tourist economy and could be open to abuse and intimidation.

I do worry that this is a one-size-fits-all approach, and may need some further exemptions. For example: If people can have BBQs in their own gardens in the restricted area, what about sections of privately owned woodland where arrangements have been made for raised fires or BBQs that mirror those on official campsites?

I endorse the strongest possible penalties to be enforced against those convicted of the proposed Offences.

I entirely agree that all the requests for constraint in past years have had little effect and the lighting of BBQs etc continues. Until a restraining order is brought in and enforced people will continue.

I feel it should be permanent ban on BBQs and fires, not just for three years.

I firmly believe that the restricted area should also include the red areas / campsites, the red areas are as important in ecology, and animal safety (campsites). Please make this across the board the only exceptions being; private residences and legitimate land management activities undertaken by those with a legal interest in the Restricted Area or their authorised agents.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

I fully agree with the proposal, however I have concerns as to how this will be policed and enforced.
I fully support PSPO 1.
I fully support the proposal.
I fully support the PSPO. [REDACTED] having witnessed the devastation caused in other areas in the past 2 years, particularly with BBQs, and the impacts on people being displaced from their homes, I wonder if the area should be widened to include all areas under the council's purview within the perambulation. I am particularly concerned about Hyde and Gorley commons for example. Also, surely one of the biggest threats to public safety is in the areas closest to where people live. Whilst outside of the Forest, [REDACTED] had to be evacuated this year because of a fire on heathland/golf course
I fully support this proposal
I have seen an example of someone using a disposable BBQ yards away from a sign saying "No BBQs". I have also come across examples of the remains of open fires at the height of summer.
I have seen disposable BBQs being used within metres of a sign saying 'no fires' in very hot, dry weather. I think that we now need a stronger deterrent.
I have seen people with BBQ's in inappropriate & dangerous places, during the prolonged hot, dry spell last summer, seen evidence of others, & heard of more incidences. It seems that many peoples' attitude to a National Park is that it is theirs to use & abuse as they wish, & that the only way to gain their attention & respect is through the threat & implication of penalties. National Parks in other countries have a set of rules that are strictly enforced, & I feel this is the only way to protect this special area from the increasing public pressure.
I have visited the New Forest regularly [REDACTED] to study and experience the wonder of Nature. The growing lack of environmental care and consequential degradation of the very environment used as a backdrop to the 'consumption party' caused by the high flux of 'cheap day out' visitors I have witnessed is concerning.
I have witnessed many people over the last few years using BBQs and lighting fires in the New Forest. I have tried talking to the people involved, usually being met with abusive language. I now report these directly to the forest keepers
I hope it gets through.
I just hope you can reduce the mindless behaviour of some of the visitors, so we can all enjoy the New Forest we love in safety!
I look forward to seeing this implemented
[REDACTED] Fire is a danger to my home, the lives of Forest creatures and to this internationally important environment. I also therefore believe that educating people should go hand in hand with these concerns [REDACTED] some of the young people participating in the DoFE (Duke of Edinburgh's Award) scheme. Whilst rules currently may vary for groups from around the country regarding cooking on stoves in the New Forest and elsewhere, those young people trained in Hampshire use Trangia stoves which have been designed to be stable and as safe as possible for young people to use. I believe that a total ban would be missing an opportunity to educate young people about the dangers and about the importance of the New Forest. Restrictions regarding the type of stove, the types of places in which they could be used ie. only on gravel/car parks etc and only under adult supervision could be made but educating an army of ambassadors for responsible behaviour would benefit the New Forest's health and future in the long run.
I personally think the boundaries should be extended further. Some parts of the forest see, not to be covered.
[REDACTED] and we wholeheartedly support anything which promotes responsible behaviour - it is our ethos. Lighting fires and BBQ's in the forest is irresponsible and potentially dangerous.
I see no need for use of BBQs in the New Forest, except in designated campsites, they are a fire risk and evidence we have seen suggests littering is often associated with the activity, a further hazard to humans, livestock and wildlife
I still think education is better than living in a police state
I strongly object to any fires and BBQs in the New Forest.
I strongly support the introduction of this order
I support the draft order No 1
I suspect NFDC may need additional powers to do this, but I would support a ban on persons willfully lighting fires in the NFNP from returning for future visits.
I think it is a good protection for the forest. Whilst BBQ's and fires have not directly affected me the number and impact around nearby parking areas does damage the grass and the smoke is unpleasant for walking.
I think it is an excellent idea & should help keep our forests safe & preserve habitat & wildlife
I think it is essential to protect the forest!

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

<p>I think it should also apply to garden fires. I grew up being told garden fires should not start till after 6pm. These days people don't care, they have them going at all times of the day weather it's summer or winter. These too get out of control very quickly. By controlling these garden fires too will help people think about what they are doing.</p>
<p>I think it should cover more area of the national park. I think people will look at this map online and think it is still okay to have fires or BBQs in the areas not covered. I have had to call the fire brigade twice before in an area not covered by this proposal (half moon Common)</p>
<p>I think it should include reference to fireworks as people have set off fireworks in the open Forest, specifically when it is not even a legal time.</p>
<p>I think that the banning of fires and charcoal based BBQs is highly desirable to reduce the risk of wild fires. However, I would suggest that the use of gas appliances that are raised off the ground present a far lower risk and would allow users of the Forest to stop and make a cup of tea using a gaz stove for example.</p>
<p>I think that there should be a complete ban on the use of fireworks as well. The risk of fire on thatched rooves along with the distress and risk of harm to wildlife seems to be forgotten in the autumn.</p>
<p>I think that there should be a nationwide ban on the sale of single use/disposable BBQs.</p>
<p>I think the maximum on the spot fine of £100 is too low for lighting a BBQ on the heath. I would make it much more punative which would bring more attention to how serious this is.</p>
<p>I think the prohibition of camp fires and BBQs should apply to all of the New Forest.</p>
<p>I think the proposed area should be the same for both orders to reduce confusion and to eliminate the envitable, know it all, that will come onto areas like Beaulieu Estate and claim because they are out of the area it is fine to light fires and have BBQ'S. ██████████ and beigable to say there is a blanket ban on fires and BBQ'S in the New Forest has solved many arguments over the years. As far as I'm concerned not including the whole area is a step backwards and will lead to more confrontations with the public</p>
<p>I think there should be more nuance to this proposal. We used to meet up with ██████████ ██████████ to have a sausage sandwich cooked on a camping stove on the old BBQ stands in the forest. I do not think this activity posed any risk to health or wildlife but is now banned. The proposal should take into account the time of year and the type of fire, for insurance banning open fires or disposable BBQ but allowing camping stove or BBQs at designated sites.</p>
<p>I think this is a welcome first step to addressing what is becoming a serious issue</p>
<p>I think this is a welcome proposal. I do think that education needs to be considered alongside this approach, although appreciate that some people still think they'll be fine and that the rules don't apply to them.</p>
<p>I thought it was already prohibited so a change can't come soon enough.</p>
<p>I totally agree with this proposal for the New Forest. However, I also feel this approach should be applied to Barton Common and the nearby beaches which I understand are managed by New Milton District Council and the Hampshire Heathlands Project.</p>
<p>I understood this was already the case - that fires, BBQs etc were prohibited in the New Forest apart from at camp sites?</p>
<p>I welcome this proposal to protect the New Forest which is a really special place. Currently, a major fire feels like a real threat & a disaster in the making. Thank you for taking this action to protect the forest & its animals.</p>
<p>I whole heartedly support these proposals which are long overdue.</p>
<p>I wholeheartedly agree with this order. I would impose much higher fines for violation of this order, however realise that is not within the power of the Authority to change. Following the devastating fires across the country in the summer I wrote to ██████████ a total ban on the sale of disposable barbecues and also sky lanterns throughout the UK. Sadly ██████████ response was Government waffle, but basically there are no plans for legislation.</p>
<p>I would like the order to include the whole of Pennington Common which according to a sign on Wainsford road is part of the New Forest. There have been at least three fires on the common in recent years.</p>
<p>I would like to add my strong support to the work of the organisations trying hard to manage and protect the New Forest for all to enjoy and for the future of the environment. These passionate people work incredibly hard to share messages positively at the risk of encountering negative responses.</p>
<p>I would like to see it expanded to all of the New Forest (ie areas outside of the proposed restricted area). We have some ground within the NFNP that has permitted access that suffers badly. I would also like to see, though not sure if possible, a ban on sales of disposable BBQs in the area. On the flip side, might it be good to push the permitted BBQ areas more, in hope that they will get used rather than non official areas. There is of course a danger that this might do the opposite and encourage BBQs in unofficial areas</p>
<p>I would like to see scope for greatly increased fines in the event of fires being caused that needed the involvement of the emergency services.</p>
<p>I would rather address these issues with better education and advice than making it a crime</p>
<p>I would wholly support the proposals</p>
<p>If carried, this restriction would have to be given a lot of publicity to make sure the visiting public are aware of it.</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

If it's going to be implemented, it needs to apply to all. Just saying, land managers with an interest on conservation, can still use fire of any sort. Goes against the whole reason for implementating the pspo in the first place.
If the use of fires and barbies is banned then the Park Authority must provide and advertise alternative sites where visitors can safely cook and the facilities to do so. If facilities are not provided or, even if they are but not advertised, visitors will continue to cook wherever they want.
In a world where people could be respectful about the impact of their behaviour, we would love to see BBQs in some areas to encourage people to experience and enjoy the forest. Unfortunately, this isn't the case. Some people are careless and with drier hotter Summers, the risk has become too big and the damage too extreme from small actions. The risk and damage outweighs the positive benefit of people connecting to nature.
In full support.
In over 26 years of living and walking the forest the only fires of any significance have been those started by the aegis terms to burn the gorse. I do not support further restrictions on those living in or visiting the forest. It is a national park and I think as much access should be given as possible.
In severe drought periods it should be extended to the Forest campsites
Include all Forestry England Campsites in the PSPO No 1, despite BBQs being off the ground. Highlight dangers of lit cigarettes thrown out of cars on all roads in the New Forest.
Increase the fines, and when people are fined, promote this to spread the word and stop further incidents.
Issue fines for non-compliance
It is a mistake to make the campsites exempt areas and not to include the Commons in the restricted areas. It is giving mixed messages - so you cannot light a fire on this 'restricted area' but hey! - come on to the Forest at Rockford Common and you can!!! It is good that there is exemption for fires used by the authorities for management purposes, there should also be provision for Commoners' livestock management purposes e.g. Branding fires etc.
It is a pity Sky lanterns were not included as well
It is an excellent proposal and one which should be implemented as soon as possible as a matter of necessity to protect the unique Forest.
It is essential that further restriction are put in place to protect this very vulnerable habitat
It is long overdue but it is saddening that it needs to be introduced
It is not the use of BBQ's or lighting fires that is the problem, it is the lack of understanding of the people using them and the potential consequences. Instead of outright banning you should be educating people and providing facilities and locations in the Forest where these activities can take place.
It is only a matter of time before we have a devastating fire in a the New Forest similar to that seen in Wareham Forest two years ago. The public should be made aware of why lighting BBQs could have a devastating effect on the environment in The New Forest. The designation of The New Forest as a national "Park" maybe gives the wrong idea (although I'm not sure what other names you would give it).
It kills many species during a fire. Sadly, banning the use won't help unless the penalties are hefty fines and possible jail term
It seems to have been successful elsewhere but sufficient resources will need to be put into enforcement
It should include fireworks and chinese lanterns
It will be highly beneficial to introduce a more robust sanction for such a dangerous activity to help reduce the risk to both people and wildlife in such an ecologically important area. Highly supportive of this proposal.
It would be good to have this in place but not sure anyone will be caught in the act unless near car parks as the area is vast.
It would be more helpful (and less confusing for the public) if the area included all areas open to the public in the new forest. Currently there are some areas that are not included but perhaps this is because they are not Crown property?
It would be potentially useful to have an additional zone to protect areas close by so as not to push all the fire issues to just outside the FE managed land. The proposal needs instigating properly, with fines in place and being collected by card machines by staff of all types across NFDC, NFNPA, HIWFRS and FE. An option similar to the speeding fines would be good, first offence which is minor you get an educational session, 2nd offence or bigger issue then comes with a fine.
It's a no brainer that they are banned
It's about time that this legislation was brought in but make sure it is policed!!
It's been a long time coming. Was very disturbed by the number of ready made barbecue hearths I saw being used at Bolderwood carpark, for example, before the Covid restrictions came into effect and the 'No barbecues or fires' notices were displayed.
It's imperative we protect the forest, expecting people to use common sense just isn't working
It's just pure commonsence, to protect a rare habitat for people and, especially, wildlife from danger and needless destruction.
It's necessary.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

Just surprised that these orders were not made some time ago.
Keen to ensure that those using stoves/cookers in their campervans whilst parked in New Forest carparks are still allowed to do so.
Last summer was one of the hottest and driest on record, if not the hottest and driest. Climate change means that we are likely to experience more summers like this in the future. Wild fires are therefore an increasing risk in the Forest. The New Forest is a very special and vulnerable place with large expanses of open heath and woodland that are at particular risk of uncontrolled fires and resulting environmental damage.
Living close to the restricted areas I am aware of the risk of uncontrolled fires close to where I live. Also recent publicity regarding the effect of large fires have on habitat greatly concerns me. If BBQs are not restricted the problem and the accompanying risk to habitat and property will increase. I really hope this proposal is accepted
Long overdue, but concerned that it will require stringent enforcing.
Looking at the map showing the restricted areas in which this PSPO will be enacted, I would like to see the restricted area extended, especially over the eastern heathlands. the whole of the perambulation should be covered to prevent the spread of wildfires during times of drought.
Most people (who are probably infrequent visitors) won't know that this is even a thing. I suspect those who were having the BBQs hadn't read any signage (even if it existed or wasn't too small), so I am not sure of the effect of this. They didn't look like the usual New Forest visitor. Larger, clearer signage would be a better start for these people. The solo person we did challenge said they did know they weren't allowed a fire but that they didn't care because they were taking precautions.
Much of the gorse/heather burning is conducted in the spring which is as detrimental to wildlife as a fire from a barbecue. More areas for safe barbecuing should be made. If someone carries a lighter it seems they can be subject to a fine which is draconian.
Must be sensible to try to reduce the risk of fires happening
My concerns are; who will monitor the areas? phone calls to the forestry numbers are received by a call centre. They have no local knowledge. If local people ask offenders to put out their fire or barbeque we usually are met with abuse. Will signage be made more prominent. Will there be firewatch towers for use in periods of very high risk. Will you actually have staff out in the forest carparks reinforcing this order?
My experience of the dangers of fires in the New Forest go back more than two years, hence my reply to that question as No. When [REDACTED] some teenagers set light to gorse bushes in the south part of the Forest [REDACTED].
My main concern is how effectively the ban can be policed. I fully support the proposal
My only concern is the enforcement of any order. Is there the "manpower" available to patrol the area and take the appropriate action. The order is toothless if not enforced and the sort of person who lights fires etc in the first place will still ignore it.
My only question is where do the resources to police this order come from? There are nowhere near enough police and rangers
Needs to be enforced fully.
Needs to be implemented to safeguard the Forest and its ecology since there appears to be a significant minority who think the rules do not apply to them, and they are incapable of starting a fire anyway.
NFDC have the chance to make a good example to all other councils in the protection of our natural world and residents to reduce the risk of fires. This is a great first step to take.
No further comments - this order is much needed.
No, except to say that the area could be wider but I understand the "politics"of the difficulties that might engender.
No, please go ahead with the order.
None other than I would support any and all exclusions of people from the Forest.
Not only should BBQ's be banned from the proposed areas but also banned from being sold in all retail outlets within the National Park.
Not sure how it would be policed. I presume that areas that have permanent BBQs will be exempt
People can have perfectly good picnics without fire. No if's, no but's, no fires.
People visiting in motorhomes with camping stoves can be used safely in car park areas. Could water points not be install with buckets and limit the areas the BBQs are permitted?
Perhaps the Council could strongly suggest that Lidl (New Milton) no longer supplies throw-away BBQss. Last time I asked what the policy was I was told Head Office approach was to allow 'personal preference' which didn't strike me as particularly sensitive to the requirements of the area or the ability of people to use sense. They may have changed policy now I suppose
Persistent problems with BBQ and fires must be treated seriously to protect the ecosystems found within the New Forest along with all wildlife and humans.
Personally I think that any fire within the New Forest area started by the public should be an offence because of the risks.
Places like Hale Purlieu should be included as we have 2 campsites operating in the village and this makes the risk of fires greater as the number of campers picnicking on the Purlieu has increased over the last few years.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

Please also consider banning fireworks and sky lanterns both of which I have observed landing still alight. We know sky lanterns caused a huge fire at a recycling facility a few years ago and that fireworks set light to thatched cottages and burn holes in polytunnels so they could easily ignite dry Heather.
Please could you extend the area to include places such as Abbotswell carpark and Hyde common. Most fires are lit within close proximity of car parks and Abbotswell rd in particular, is a very popular car park.
Please ensure that if this goes through its actually enforced - we all know Forestry England don't care at all about the forest. Please also include fireworks & sky lanterns within this.
Pleased that most local outlets do not stock portable BBQs
Possibly consider installing public barbecue points, such as in Bournemouth
Proposals are clear, unambiguous and enforceable.
Propose that there is significant increase in police and ranger presence to actually fine and prosecute rather than engage and inform
Re: the earlier question regarding whether I have experienced any problems with fires in the last 2 years - not fires, but BBQs have been a frequent problem over the last 2 years (and before), both from illegal 'wild camping' and BBQs on the open Forest near car parks. The Restricted Area map is quite detailed but seems to exclude certain areas of open Forest that should be included in the Restricted Area. Whilst the narrative defines 'public spaces' this does not tally with the area on the map. Perhaps the Restricted Area map could cover the entire perambulation of the New Forest and the caveat that the restriction does not apply to private land would remove this confusion.
Regular enforcement necessary, increase in staffing needed?
Restrictions need to be in place to stop the use of BBQs In the national park. If enhanced fines etc are needed then so be it. We need to protect the forest, the animals and the land.
Sad that this has to happen but people are not able to make sensible decisions for themselves.
Should we include Chinese Lanterns and possibly fireworks?
Signage would have to be extremely clear and a presence would need to be made by the enforcers at key potential areas of concern at the height of the summer, otherwise there's no point putting a PSPO in place
Sledgehammer to crack a very small nut. If this goes cat head the cot of enforcement officers will drain much needed funds from more essential needs. I have lived in the forest for [REDACTED] and never once seen a fire or out of control BBQ, bar intended blazes by the council.
Some more BBQ allocated sites would be helpful.
Some who light barbecues are not aware that it is a danger. Large signs are needed at entrances to the Forest to make people aware of the prohibition and the penalties.
Strongly in favour of this. Local resident for total of [REDACTED], regular visitor when not resident.
Strongly support
Strongly worded signage and readily available marketing material is needed together with an increase in support for those officers who are tasked with engaging with members of the public carrying out the banned activities. Unfortunately there are many people who believe they are entitled and rules don't apply to them. The full weight of the PSPO should be handed down on them. Greater emphasis should be made on those shops who still sell disposable BBQs in and around the New Forest to remove them from their shelves. I really hope the introduction of this PSPO proves beneficial in protecting this unique place I feel privileged to live in.
Thank you for helping to protect the forest.
The banning of the sale of disposable BBQs would help.
The Authority has made provision for safe barbecues but perhaps should make more available
The commoners burn alot of gorse ect during nesting seasons ect . Will they be controlled more.?
The council can't even maintain the emptying of bins, especially at busy periods(it always comes as a surprise!!) Controlling, power hungry morons.... common sense, not a fine....another tax!!! Who exactly will have the power to issue fines? Do gooders with a ego trip.... All the signage in the world will not prevent this....the country has gone to sh#@!

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

The danger of wildfires in the New Forest is very prevalent as the climate changes and the summers become hotter and drier and all methods of preventing wildfires must be pursued. I would also like barbeques to be banned from use on the various campsites within the Forest. I saw a barbeque in position in the [REDACTED] campsite during the last summer and, although it stood on a frame to allow it to be placed at waist height and was powered by gas and the possibility of a fire starting from it slim, it should not have been allowed. Something hot from it could have reached the ground and started a fire. Its presence also could provoke an argument as to why other forms of barbeque should be allowed and elsewhere in the Forest. A complete ban would prevent those arguments and grey areas being developed.

The detail maps are NOT accurate - [REDACTED] proposed area map detailed [REDACTED] do have exclusions drawn around them. (see more details below). I agree with the aims of the proposals, but NOT with the use of PSPO's which are very heavy handed and will criminalise day trippers and other tourists who often cannot be expected to know better. Educating these people via appropriate information channels should be the objective. It should be done in a way which is as non-intrusive as possible - no-one wants additional signage spoiling our beautiful forest. Perhaps Websites and social media offer a more discrete way to do this. There is a lack of accuracy and consistency - currently there exclusion areas missing from the proposed land areas map including my own and my neighbours private property. If the proposal is enacted then the definition and mapping must be accurate. Whilst the background information indicates that : 'This is land that is open to the air and to which the public are entitled or permitted to have access, on payment or otherwise, as of right or by virtue of express or implied permission. For example, it would not apply to a resident who wanted to enjoy a BBQ in their own garden.' This statement is contradicted by the supporting maps which have many detailed exclusion areas defined, but not all; for instance [REDACTED]. Either the maps must be 100% accurate, which also then has problems for potential changes and new-builds, OR for the avoidance of doubt a very clear statement about the exclusion of all private properties would cover current and any new-builds whilst allowing a less detailed mapping such as used for proposal 2.

The Dorset Open Land PSPO which came into force on 1st July 2022 includes explicit prohibition on "lighting fires, barbeques (including disposable barbeques), Chinese lanterns or fireworks". The NFDC draft uses nearly identical language, but excludes restrictions on fireworks and sky lanterns. All other extant PSPOs targeting wildfires on moorlands, peatland, coastal and heathland habitat have the same restrictions as Dorset. I appreciate that New Forest District Council have been very careful in proceeding with this PSPO. They have benefitted from other authorities experiences during the eight years these powers have existed. They should regard the existing wildfire PSPOs as boilerplate, having met criteria of evidence, and legal practice. The advantages of adding these restrictions to the PSPO: Consistent with best practice as shown in other wildfire PSPOs. Consistent with rules of the authority on our Western border, where crossborder incidents have and may occur. Consistent with HCC, NFDC, and National Park policies banning sky lanterns from events. The risk of wildfires to the public outweighs the negligible loss of enjoyment in the public space. The increasing risk of summer wildfires as the effects of climate change continue. Explicit prohibition may be more legally robust than relying on catch all. Waiting to amend at the next review would incur further expense on signage. The evidence for such prohibition lies more in susceptibility; where it would be unlikely to find proof of either sky lanterns or fireworks in the aftermath of a 200 hectare heathland fire, a risk assessment should suffice. The Forest has had problems from sky lanterns documented by Forestry England and leading to prohibition as noted on the New Forest National Park Website, and we shouldn't want a pattern of incidents to indicate the need for restrictions. List of consistent habitat Wildfire PSPOs includes: Dorset County, Barnsley, Oldham, Tameside, Kirklees, City of Bradford, High Peak Borough Council, Bolton Council, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council, Calderdale West Yorkshire, Newark and Sherwood District Council. National Park website page on wildfires: "the lighting of sky lanterns is prohibited in the New Forest due to the risk of wild fires and harm to wildlife." <https://www.newforestnpa.gov.uk/visiting/help-care-for-the-forest/no-wildfires-please/>

The draft wording , relating to "carrying anything capable of creating a naked flame" would apply to a cigarette lighter or a box of matches. Is it, therefore the intention of the Order to ban any cigarette smoking anywhere within the area? If so is that an infringement of human rights?

The exceptions should be for any official campsite, not just for forestry England campsites.

The fine is paltry and hardly a deterrent at all. It should be increased at least ten fold!

The fines and prosecution in my opinion are draconian. Continue to educate not dictate!

The Forest is a fabulous asset for the public to enjoy in many ways. This can and should include BBQ's is specific sites. Other countries allow this and it works well. Why not here in the UK? However in the other countries the public are much more respectful and leave the sites as the found them clean tidy etc ready for the next person to enjoy and so on. That is not how many UK people would treat them. so I will contradict my self and say no to BBQ's in the Forest. However I do feel that control of the New Forest is becoming draconian especially with regard to the use of Beaulieu Heath model flying site being more restrictive. Based on NO evidence.

The Forest Rambling Club had an organised walk from Broomy Walk car park on Weds 9th November. I found 5 or 6 firework rocket sticks and chemical firework debris which I removed from the site. Witnessed by several others in the group on the walk. [REDACTED] also had other experience of firework debris in the new Forest.

The general public will still argue that it is 'their right' to do what they want to do. Well yes on your own land. Public do not understand that much of the land is owned by Forestry England and I totally back them with what they want to do. People have also asked me, if they cannot have a BBQ could they use a camping stove to boil water for a cuppa!!! General public do not seem to have the concept that even that is a heat source.

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

<p>The heathland catches fire very quickly and until people have experienced this they are unaware of the dangers. Well done to those who are having to fight these fires things have got better since the 80s.</p>
<p>The maximum fine of £100 should be a minimum. I can foresee problems in enforcing the PSPO without police in attendance.</p>
<p>The most important issue is to protect the flora and fauna of the New Forest for this generation and future generations. The pressure on this landscape will only increase in the future from the ever expanding population so needs as much protection as it is possible to give.</p>
<p>The most important thing is that these new restrictions should be ENFORCED!</p>
<p>The only concern is should not barbecues be allowed on the campsites where they can be monitored by the camp warden and what about designated barbecue areas such as Bolderwood, where there are used very successfully</p>
<p>The order could be wider and ban fireworks and Chinese lanterns which pose similar risks to barbecues</p>
<p>The possible loss to wildlife, flora and fauna in the restricted area needs to be protected, also in these areas are peoples homes and livelihoods/businesses. All must be protected, I 100%support the proposed Bill.</p>
<p>The problem you outline is not restricted to visitors or tourists it is also members of our local communities, who you may argue "should know better"! However, I feel that the proposed restrictions are reasonable and may help to either prevent or reduce the detrimental effect of the behaviour. I do feel that the enforcement of the PSBO and issuing FPN has the potential to lead to conflict situations with the risk of injury and an incident spiralling out of control. Enforcement is not easy. From your material I note that "Authorised Officer" means a constable or person authorised in writing by the Council for the purposes of this Order. The Police are primarily responsible for preventing crime and keeping the peace or keeping the community safe. Due to their numbers, I assume that "council officers" will be also able to enforce PSPO who, unlike police officers do not have conflict management experience and training. Can they even demand a name and address to issue an FPN? The effective implementation of a PSPO must continue to be part of a broader approach that includes several different initiatives to tackle the problems i.e., preventing both reducing the likelihood of it occurring and reducing the potential impact. I am a firm believer in education and communication to prevent the activity, e.g. short presentations at schools, colleges, and communities to spread understanding of the issue and continued messages in the media etc. This type of behaviour is always about changing behaviour of the public, enforcement should be the last resort.</p>
<p>The prohibition of selling disposable BBQs in the national park would help immensely.</p>
<p>The proposal order is a practical but unfortunate necessity which has been reasonably introduced to counteract irresponsible behaviour regarding BBQs in the most part. While I do agree that actions need to be taken to tackle this, and a blanket approach to the issue is likely the most effective way I cannot help but feel penalised. I have been BBQing/cooking in the forest responsibly for over 20 years, I enjoy cooking and eating outdoors and the freedom associated with it, particularly as [REDACTED] and this is the most enjoyable area which we have natural ties with, along with this it's a cost effective way to enjoy cooked food on a hike. Outdoor cooking is a great opportunity for me to teach and pass down skills and safety knowledge regarding the forest to my children, so hopefully they can enjoy the same experience they have had with me, with their children. To conclude, yes the proposal is necessary to combat instances that cause a risk or hazard from outdoor cooking, and this is true when considering tourism and the unthought of risks regarding outdoor cooking. However, there needs to be a mechanism in place to allow for outdoor BBQing/cooking to take place in unrestricted locations for people who are responsible and take the necessary precautions to ensure the wider safety of both the forest and the public. Whether this be in the form of licensing or meeting a set of safety criteria while cooking needs to be determined. Potentially, reasonable licencing could provide a modest stream or revenue to counteract and deter illegal cooking while allowing responsible parties to enjoy the benefit of it. There are many factors to consider, especially in todays society but remember that there is a proportion of it which is capable and responsible. Hopefully all of the aforementioned is taken in to consideration and a fairer, more reasonable approach is thoroughly considered before any decision is made and finalised.</p>
<p>The proposed covered area should extend to all parts of the Forest and nearby areas such as Beaulieu where the same risks exist.</p>
<p>The proposed PSPO No 1 plan is long overdue. It is essential to act swiftly and protect the Forest</p>
<p>The proposed restricted area is insufficient as it doesnt include areas owned by Hampshire County Council such as Hyde Common. BBQs have been seen in use by Abbotswell Car Park and the cricket pitch. Any fires in these areas could very quickly damage residents homes as well as the local ecology. Likewise all campsites in the Forest should be included in the restricted areas as their use of BBQs and firepits causes nuisance and risk. An example would be [REDACTED]. This campsite also stores significant stocks of wood for firepits at their other sites and this should not be acceptable without Fire Brigade approval of their safety plans. Finally I'd suggest that special licences should be introduced for events that use BBQs/hog roasts etc. Domestic BBQs should probably be exempt.</p>
<p>The PSPO is too broad. Gas BBQs and stoves should not be included in the proposal.</p>
<p>The PSPO's are only useful if they are enforced, hopefully the council have made provision for this.</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

<p>The restricted area should include: Hale Purlieu which is administered by the National Trust. Hatchet Green and Hale Park. These 3 areas have been left off the restricted area and fall within the National Park and New Forest DC and are subject to the same fire risk as the restricted area. Hale Park in particular has run Pop Up camp sites for the last 3 years and encourages the use of fire pits and BBQ's by hiring them out. Last year was of particular concern as the area was tinder dry and the use of fire pits and BBQ's put the hamlet of Hatchet Green at considerable risk with its numerous thatched cottages [REDACTED] that the prospect of a PSPO would save guard this from happening in the future. I am therefore very disappointed that this area has not been included in the restricted area and would like this to be the case.</p>
<p>The restricted zone needs to include Frogham, Blissford and Hyde which ALL have commons and nearby open forest, where tourists use disposable BBQs because of the good car parks at Abbotswell. [REDACTED] Campsite is a Fire Risk because of the use of Fire Pits</p>
<p>The risk is clear you only have to look at the damage caused by fire at important ecological sites last year.</p>
<p>The sooner the better these suggestions are implemented the better</p>
<p>The sooner the better, but enforcement is the key to ensuring these measures have an effect. If there is no enforcement you may as well not bother. If approved you will need to have a blitz in the early days in order to get publicity that you are an organisation that has some teeth. Unfortunately you track record in areas such as this is not good.</p>
<p>The use of BBQs and lighting of fires is a clear danger to the environment and public. Whilst not related restrictions should also be considered to control dogs of lead which chase livestock and impact wildlife. We have also had several encounters with dogs off the lead which have been aggressive and frightened our children!</p>
<p>The use of fireworks outside November 5th and New Years Eve should be banned. They cause great distress to animals.</p>
<p>[REDACTED] strongly support the introduction of this order.</p>
<p>The whole Beaulieu area should be included in the restricted area for PSO1</p>
<p>The wording includes for potential enforcement by an 'authorised officer'. I think there should be clarity on who is this and how is he/she is recognised. Also, if there is no officer present, a similar clarity on how is he/she to be contacted.</p>
<p>There are far too many people in the NF and nature should be given a chance to survive. Over population is main issue!</p>
<p>There are more wildfires now than before, now that the climate change is so evident. Chinese lanterns are banned in other National Parks and should be banned in The New Forest to protect everybody including livestock, feed and wildlife to name a few. It cannot be policed. If allowed there will be several fires at once within an area difficult to reach in some instances.</p>
<p>There is no need for BBQs. People should pack picnics and not cook food. It's a huge risk. My dog nearly walked on a hot BBQ left on a beach. It's more of a risk in protected areas of killing wildlife and decimating protected areas.</p>
<p>There is nothing about enforcement and the order would be of little use if not properly enforced</p>
<p>There must be sufficient staff/rangers to robustly enforce any order/fines.</p>
<p>There should be further restriction on retail premises selling disposable BBQs. Preferably there should be an outright ban on the sale of disposable BBQs nationally. If not local tolls should be levied to make the disposable BBQs expensive enough to cause vendors to consider alternatives like using food retail outlets or pre prepared picnic food stuffs. Tolls revenue can be used to provide dedicated safe BBQ controlled areas and more effective fire risk education for the general public.</p>
<p>There should be signage in all car parks in the Forest advising (a) the ban and the penalties for breaching it but also (b) the nearest location where fires/BBQ are permitted.</p>
<p>There will be many responsible people who would be disappointed by this legislation but unfortunately we have to benchmark against irresponsible idiots who are careless. It only takes one.</p>
<p>There will need to be more official BBQ sites available to the public which are monitored. Too much damage is done by wildfires to continue as at present.</p>
<p>These orders will have no effect unless they are accompanied by an effective form of policing them.</p>
<p>Think this a necessary proposal. I haven't witnessed fires but I have seen the damage that BBQ's have done to the forest and feel that anything that can be done to reduce the risk of wildfires and the devastation they cause can only be a good thing. I would like to see the council take action in the form of a PSPO order against cycling on the open forest and the damage that causes to habitat in addition to fire prevention and the feeding and petting of livestock.</p>
<p>This area should include all of the New Forest, including areas around Lyndhurst, Beaulieu, Brockenhurst, etc. the only areas to be excluded (with small fires / BBQ permitted) should be manned camp sites.</p>
<p>This is a good step forward in helping people understand their responsibilities when they are enjoying the Forest.</p>
<p>This is a very slanted questionnaire in as much as everyone is worried about wild fires. I cannot see why BBQs cannot be used in safe area such as BBQ pits.</p>
<p>This is a welcome initiative for locals as fires are a threat in dry weather to homes and the ecology. Hoping the proposal will go through to approval.</p>
<p>This is an essential order to preserve the Flora and Fauna of the New Forest and to reduce the risk to life.</p>
<p>This is essential to prevent damage to the environment, people and wildlife</p>
<p>This is long overdue - please give us the orders to protect our forest.</p>
<p>This is much needed to protect the Forest - I fully support this.</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

This is needed, I have often come across remains of fires and discarded barbecues. The fines are too small, compared to the damage to forest if a major fire occurring.
This is one of the tools that should be made available to those that work in the forest when needed to enforce, educate and protect the new forest.
This order should be limited to times of drought only.
This proposal is an excellent idea but does have one major drawback. That is, how is it going to be enforced? [REDACTED] on the forest around Mockbeggar, Ibsley and Rockford Common and over three years I can only recollect seeing someone in those areas from either the National Trust, National Park/Forestry England less than five times.
This PSPO is essential for the on-going safety of flora, fauna, residents and visiting members of the public
This restriction would be a very sensible safeguard for all residents and wildlife, but I think it will need to be strongly enforced for the first 2-3 years to get the message known and understood. Many visitors to the New Forest do not take care, and do not read the signs.
This seems to be of critical importance with the likelihood of dryer and hotter summers in future - evidence from last years fires at SSSI in Dorset suggest it is a matter of time before we suffer a major fire within the designated area representing a high threat to the ecology and possibly public safety
This should also specifically include fireworks and Chinese lanterns
This should apply to all of the National Park.
This should not be used as a means to ban smoking in the Forest (virtually unenforceable), although that should be discouraged. Also, we should avoid over-zealous application of the rules, eg prosecution of someone because they are carrying a cigarette lighter in their pocket. I make these comments as someone who abhors smoking, but we have to be sensible and reasonable.
This will have to be enforced in some way and not just allowed to fester like most other activities which cause harm to the Forest. For example the way cycling all over the Forest has not been controlled and is now totally out of control. When was the last fine for feeding ponies been issued?
This will only work if there is enforcement.
Three years is a start but this should be permanent
To ban all shops and outlets selling disposable BBQs. All BBQs in authorised areas only
To be effective enforcement and some prosecutions will be required.
To support the ban, shops, campsites and similar in the local area (Lyminster, Ringwood, Highcliffe, Totton and areas in the forest itself) should be banned from selling single use barbecues.
To whom this will concern , some few years ago I sent an email to NFDC with ref to fires being lit for the purpose of picnics and the like in the forest, of which I received a very pleasant reply, and the communication was most pleasing and enjoyable to myself. e At the moment I am not able to find or retrieve a copy of those emails. I shall therefor to the best of my memory repeat some of what I had written at the time. [REDACTED] My memory tells me that there was at that time unspoken rules that must and would be adhered to by the general public. One of which was blocking entrances to what we used to call the rides, (entrance to the forest closures) the other being the most serious and destructive, FIRES. The consequences of which going against could be severe. [REDACTED] Now my point is this, I cannot understand for the life of me why BBQ fire's have been tolerated over these last many years in the NEW FOREST. If NFDC decide to bring in rules or laws against the public lighting fire's in the forest, which I assume don't already exist, then there must be way's of dissuading this dangerous practice from happening. One of which might be (and I refrain from suggesting new fire watch towers) to have forest patrollers at week end's and bank holiday's, looking for those who thoughtlessly build these fire's. I would think that instead of new watch towers, that drones could be used. Also, that on television, let it be known that these activities will not be tolerated by the NFDC. Of course such a statement cannot be made unless it can be backed up.
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I wish the forest and all those who work in and for it VERY WELL.
Too broad in area: worth doing for heathland but the woodland remains safe for fires. Concerned about the complete ban and the impact on Duke of Edinburgh and other long distance hikers. You expect them to enter an official campsite where they are not staying in order to brew a cup of tea or heat food? Finally, how are you going to enforce it properly when you don't have enough people to cover the popular areas, let alone all the forest? If you are going to turn a blind eye to the rest, better to come up with a draft order which covers the popular areas only and leave the other parts.
Too many people have absolutely no idea about how to respect the forest and fires and BBQs are the most destructive and long lasting ways to destroy the forest.
Totally support this. Fire's are too much risk to wildlife, nature and ponies

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

<p>Unfortunately the NFNP has/is being promoted as a recreational play area for the general public. It is in fact a precious resource that should have all the relevant protections in place to ensure the flora and fauna, some of which can only be found within the park's boundary, can exist and thrive without risk or stress or indeed damage. So far we have been fortunate not to have had any uncontrolled fires as a result of BBQ's in the north of the forest near to ██████████ Nomansland BUT I do regularly find the remains of disposable BBQ's when out walking the forest and surrounding heathland. In several cases the people responsible have just got up and left the smouldering embers, cardboard plates, plastic knives and forks, empty drinks cartons, glass bottles etc. All of which pose a real danger to wildlife and the commoners various animals. I'm afraid for the future of the stunning wildlife and countryside that we are fortunate to have here in the New Forest unless more control and most importantly enforcement of laws are put in place.</p>
<p>Very good idea, but how is it going to be successfully policed and applied?</p>
<p>Very much needed as people do not behave</p>
<p>Very supportive of this proposal</p>
<p>Way overdue especially given such dry summers and visitors who display an ignorance of understanding. If action is not taken to minimise fire risk a catastrophic fire will occur sooner rather than later.</p>
<p>We are concerned about the impact of fires on the bio-diversity of the Forest and the danger to wildlife that they pose.</p>
<p>We are experiencing a significant climate shift towards warmer, drier summers. This increases the risk of fire in the New Forest significantly. It is imperative that we act now to prevent disaster. Not acting is not an option. However, the New Forest, along with other National Parks, needs a fully funded ranger service to enforce the rules and educate the public.</p>
<p>We fully support the PSPO and would like to see planned review and the potential to widen the scope (e.g. geographical area). Also we would support bringing the wording in line with similar PSPOs (e.g. in Dorset) to specifically mention sky lanterns and fireworks</p>
<p>We fully support the PSPO and would like to see planned review and the potential to widen the scope (including geographical area). We would also be in favour of making it explicit that sky lanterns and fireworks are included in the order (see wording used by Dorset County Council)</p>
<p>We have lots of rules now - none are actually implemented/enforced. There must be paid staff whose job it is specifically to enforce this. Forestry England staff are useless including keepers.</p>
<p>██████████ Canford Heath and there are often frighteningly large fires on the Heath. I cannot see it is necessary to have a BBQ.</p>
<p>We must look after and protect our environment, at all costs</p>
<p>We need more forest rangers on the ground with easy contact to inform them of fires illegal fishing incidents litter and cyclists riding in areas not permitted, Which I have witnessed numerous times especially in summer times when the forest is full of outsiders not local people whom have no respect for our beautiful forest?.</p>
<p>We should encourage responsible access for all. It is imperative that efforts to educate the public come first and the PSPO is only used as a last resort. Information to the public both locals and visitors needs to be clear as to why this is needed. Perhaps signage making the public aware of the PSPO could include a QR code leading to a simple explanation of this need. On the restricted area there are possible areas of confusion for the public and those enforcing the PSPO. As one example - the area immediately to the SW of the C17 road (running NW to SE, south of the A31 at Stoney Cross) is not FE land but there is no boundary to show this, and most would be unaware of it. How will this be dealt with? We would not want to delay the implementation of this PSPO as it represents a significant step forward, but perhaps this is a matter for future iterations?</p>
<p>We welcome this initiative and are pleased to see this issue being taken seriously at last. The restricted area should be extended to include Frogham. It is understandable that private barbecues etc should still be allowed, but it is not right that campsite owners make a profit from hiring firepits and selling wood, whilst posing a serious threat to local properties. Locals here have experienced embers landing in their gardens, very close to thatched properties, and it is only a matter of time before the worst happens. We would welcome a much stronger line that says that firepits and barbecues should be banned on all 'permitted development' campsites, which do not have the purpose-built facilities of Forestry England sites.</p>
<p>When arrangements are in place to administer the current proposal, the National Trust and other landowners should be encouraged to have their land added to the restricted area. Test Valley Borough Council and Wiltshire Council she have an equivalent PSPO covering their part of the New Forest.</p>
<p>When considering the habitat destruction in Wareham Forest we were exceedingly lucky not to have a similar situation in the New Forest this year with such a dry year. In large part this is due to the hard work of the FE rangers and keepers but they should not have to put up with abusive language and behaviour from the public. A stronger means of enforcing the bye-laws with on the spot fines is the only way to stop the Forest going up in flames. Relying on the public to be educated and responsible has shown itself time and again to be completely ineffective.</p>
<p>While it is a relatively natural and very necessary process to have controlled burning in the Forest, informal fires of whatever sort are not controlled and can do untold harm to every aspect which makes the New Forest so internationally important. The penalties must be severe enough to act as a real deterrent; if they are not or they are not enforced, it will bring law generally into disrepute.</p>

Q7. Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed PSPO No. 1?

Whilst I am supportive of the use of PSPO to improve enforcement of BBQs and fires in the open forest the proposed area encapsulates a number of campsites where responsible use of BBQs should be retained. Given there are wardens at all the campsites who can enforce any rules relating to BBQs (e.g. off ground etc) there is no need to ban them let alone criminalise their use, this is not a proportional response to the level of risk arising from limited areas which are highly supervised.
Whilst I wholeheartedly support the introduction of PSPO's, I do wonder whether the resources will be available to "police" the areas concerned and then how easy it will be for the council officer, or agent, to actually issue the notice to the offender(s) at the site.
Who is going to enforce it?
Why are some areas omitted in the map that are open access? Why is the map not the same as Proposal 2? That would make far more sense.
Why does the restricted area exclude Setley Plain? [REDACTED], it was tinder dry in the summer, and is heavily grazed by ponies and cattle. A fire here would devastate the area and put lives and property at risk.
Why is Hale Purlieu, Hatchet Green and Hale Park omitted from the map?
Why is the area not extended to whole national park. There is a gap on the heath behind Hardely and the beaulieu area?
Why is the whole of the New Forest not in the proposed PSPO No1 and just parts of it. Are the areas outside of the restricted areas fire proof? Is the gorse a special breed that doesn't catch fire? How are you going to enforce it? You don't do anything atm for law breakers - you just give them advice and hope that that is enough!! I'm afraid you have a very blinkered view of how the public behaves. You think that as they have been told off they won't do it again! They will just go somewhere else in the Forest
Why not charge for the forest car parks to enable the funding for rangers and signs to better inform the public on the rules and enable the policing of those rules.
Why not include the likes of Royden woods, Ivy woods etc etc .. fireworks and sky lanterns should also be included
With climate change and hotter summers, we need to be increasingly vigilant to stop the possibility of wild fires in the Forest, that endanger wildlife and the bio-diversity of the area.
With climate change bringing hotter, drier summers and increased numbers of visitors to the New Forest, I think these measures are essential.
With increasing temperatures during the holiday season there are real risks of wild fires. By removing barbecues we are removing one of those triggers for the fires.
With the dry summers we have experienced and which are likely to continue it is ESSENTIAL that protection is given to the forest to avoid the devastation that has been caused in certain areas of the South.
With the ever increasing hot summers that we now endure it is timely that this preventative measure is put in place.
With the evidence of 'Climate change' with us, recent hot and excessively drought periods etc., the danger of wild fires taking hold becomes a greater risk as more people visit the Forest and have such silly ideas as to what 'recreation' means. One only has to see the regular devastation caused to areas near Poole, Dorset with wayward wildfires, let alone those seen abroad.
Wondering how it will be policed.....
[REDACTED] supports the initiative which would lead to greater powers to prohibit the lighting of fires in the New Forest. This is particularly welcomed as the recent hot, dry summers have exacerbated this issue.
Yes, The shaded area at Black Heath/ Linwood fails to accurately define the true boundary between land under the responsibility of the National Trust (Rockford & Ibsley Commons and the New Forest Crown Lands. The triangle of open space bounded by the north side of the Linwood Road in Appleslade Bottom, [REDACTED] (west facing), the land boundary of [REDACTED] and the gravel track leading down to [REDACTED] will be unprotected if the Map 1 boundary is not corrected at this location. Failure to rectify the omission of this triangular space from the PSPO No 1 will create a magnet for those parties wishing to challenge the protection of the PSPO ! and any ensuing addition such as wild camping that might arise in future. The legal status on this triangle of open space on Map 1 can only be weaker than its surrounds and needs to be rectified. Please note the house name [REDACTED] has very recently been changed by the owner to [REDACTED] which will confuse the issue. If there are any doubts about the location and alignment of the boundary (NT vs Forest), please consult the OS mapping where the Boundary Stone (BS) from the 1600s is still to be found. The same BS is in situ on the open ground.
Yes, this is essential to protect the forest, even more important now the huge increase in visitor numbers. But, will need the rules to be enforced.
Yes. basically, you can burn the forest down for £75 if you pay within 14 days...get a clever corrupt developer you are risking losing the area for £75! A bargain for a developer ...this fine should be well in excess of £10,000 considering the amount of damage it causes to the health of people and wildlife. It takes in excess of 5 years for it to regenerate. NFDC you really need to consider whether you want to keep the area as a "forest". You are at high risk of losing it and in my opinion that is a huge loss that I believe you don't appreciate, possibly because it's taken for granted, by many locals in this area. shame on you.