

Appendix 2: Schedule of Responses to the Consultation on the Draft Fish Quay Neighbourhood Plan Supplementary Planning Document

Vision		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	I am entirely in agreement.	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	In the main excellent - anything that enhances our local area is a plus however there is a lot of places that need enhancing.	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	the combination of unique function (fishing), history & recreation is fundamental to the vision for the future.	The Vision addresses this special combination.
North Tyneside resident	In favour.	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	All very nice sounding: Reality will require the management of work v leisure interests. I believe the work of which fishing is very important should not be neglected for the sake of the pretty penthouse crowd	A key theme throughout the document is the need to retain the very important fishing industry and for it not to be compromised for the sake of other uses.
North Tyneside resident	Appears fine - but why not pass on the human body parts ie historic heart, commercial pulse and creative heads. Hearts can be associated with heart attacks, pulse with a weak pulse and creative heads can be associated with bodiless heads..... In short this is the usual council speak which is meaningless to the person in the street	This is not "Council speak" at all. The Vision was prepared entirely by the NP Group with no assistance from the Council representative. As a Neighbourhood Plan SPD it was important that the overall Vision was created by the neighbourhood. As it was prepared by "people in the street" we would hope that others would understand it.

North Tyneside resident	Agree with the ideas set down.	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	1.4.4 and 1.4.7 As a general principal, the views of the river, Fish Quay, Cliffords Fort etc should be opened up when approaching by access routes such as Brewhouse Bank and Tanners Bank	"To protect and enhance the conservation area and historic environment" is a overall priority at 1.4.7. Conservation area management involves the preservation and enhancement of important views. Views are discussed throughout the SPD.
North Tyneside resident	1.4.5 "Fish Quay" typo	Amended.
North Tyneside resident	1.5.4 "Entrepreneurs" should also be included in this clause in addition to "developers"	Added.
North Tyneside resident	I agree with these statements	Noted.
Nexus representative	Nexus are generally in support the regeneration of the Fish Quay area, and its potential for improved tourism/leisure, housing, and commercial uses.	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	1.3. Sounds good hopefully it will work	Noted.

North Tyneside resident	1.4.7 To protect and enhance the conservation area and historic environment. About 200 years of history have been lost by the planting of about 80+ trees next to the Highlight obstructing views that would encourage foot visitors to use the steps down to the fish quay thus alleviating traffic congestion issues	The Banksides Management Strategy (that this SPD supports) addresses the need to maintain balance between views and biodiversity in the area.
North Tyneside resident	1.5.3 Re high quality level . We have to work within limited budgets in this economic environment	Noted, but we believe a high quality of works should be expected, especially for the important heritage assets mentioned in this paragraph.
Trustees of The Net	Neighbourhood Plan's Vision is in line with that of The Net, and Trustees are particularly gratified that the desirability of a Heritage Centre has some prominence in the document.	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	1.3 To add to its sustainability, all developments should aim to be carbon neutral, in construction and use, and existing buildings and activities should aim to reduce substantially their carbon footprints .	The vision makes reference to sustainability. Vision covers many aspects but can't cover them all in detail.
North Tyneside resident	1.4.1 To provide a future which is sustainable, ecologically and in every way, for...	Sentence amended to cover all aspects of sustainability.
North Tyneside resident	1.4.4...transport links, especially by foot , cycle, public transport and taxi, which are convenient and well signed....	Sentence covers all forms of transport already.
North Tyneside resident	1.4.6 To develop a community which promotes the health of those who live there, which comprises.....	Sentence is discussing land uses. "open green areas" has been added.

North Tyneside resident	1.4.7.. ' the wildlife corridor' and plant trees and native bushes wherever possible	Sentence added "1.4.11 To protect and enhance the Fish Quay's green areas and open spaces." The planting of the more trees would not be advocated in this document - the Banksides Management Plan covers this kind of issue.
North Tyneside resident	1.4.10 to ensure that the visitor experience is enhanced by ensuring that cover and sheltered seating is available even when cafes, the heritage centre etc are not open.	An objective has been added into the tourism section, which is the most appropriate place for this point to go.
North Tyneside resident	I think it is fundamentally flawed since it seeks to continue to accommodate the fishing industry. The area will ONLY thrive and develop into the multi-faceted hub envisaged in the document once the fishing sector is relocated to a purpose built industrial zone. The vision in 1.3 can only be fulfilled without fish. I cannot find a single example in the UK where such redevelopment has successfully occurred without the existing 'industry; being relocated. For example... in London... Covent Garden, Smithfield, and Billingsgate etc etc. The problem with fish is the smell and mess. It will NEVER coexist with the utopian dream outlined here. Grasping this nettle was beyond the group.	The Group believe the fishing industry is vital to the character and future success of the area.

North Tyneside resident	A core fault with the Plan is that it appears to sit in a splended isolation and over concentrates on ONE specific area... immediately around Fish Quay. Looking at the bigger picture and including the WHOLE of the two Conservation Areas AND the effect of Smith's Dock redevelopment would have produced a more rounded and comprehensive plan.	Most attention may be given to this area in the SPD because it is the area that sees most activity, is seeing the most change at the moment, etc. However, the importance of links to surrounding areas is referenced throughout the SPD. Discussion on the development of Smith's Dock has been added at 2.8 and 6.2.1.
North Tyneside resident	A catch-all say, nothing piece of gobbledegook.	Noted.
Places for People representative	In principle fully support the vision to ensure the Fish Quay celebrates its history but more importantly going forward it grows as a destination for residents, businesses and returning visitors.	Noted.
Places for People representative	Overall priorities need to address what will draw future investment into the area if the lure of the fishing boats is lost? I appreciate the Fish Quay is currently bucking the trend of UK fishing ports but the overall decline of the British fishing industry is a critical factor to the success of the area. What will the attraction be if the fishing industry is lost?	Information we have received from employers in the Fish Quay suggest that the fishing Industry will remain in the area for the foreseeable future. This SPD advocates more attraction beyond the fishing industry though: small business, leisure, tourism, residential...

Suggested land uses and key objectives		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	I am entirely in agreement.	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	In the main looking good however there are still of lot of orange on the map for use of mixed services!! I think there is a place for a Museum and Art Gallery based solely on Fish Quay History as is known so far today and for any new reports in the future can be added. Artists love painting this area and it would be a place to bring others to the Fish Quay from outside the area. This museum could house a book shop based on books written about the Fish Quay and also a small cafe to rest and a place to stay for a while. Perhaps this should be positioned in a popular part of the area maybe overlooking our famous River Tyne.	The Group do not wish to stifle development, and are open to a suitable range of uses in the area, so have suggested that several areas for a mix of uses. As outlined in the SPD, the juxtaposition of uses would only be acceptable where it would not give rise to unacceptable conflict. The facility described in this response is encouraged in the objectives of the SPD, and indeed such a facility is currently under development at the FQ - "the net" at the Old Low Light.
North Tyneside resident	It appears to be balanced	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	In favour.	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	OK.	Noted.

North Tyneside resident	Appears fine.	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	Agree	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	I think the green space allocated around Clifford St should be dynamic and not end up a patch of grass,it could easily incorporate low rise draw in development to link up with the leisure area opposite,this is the main access to the riverside walk which is well used. Note the pink area adjacent has already been partly refurbished and will not be touched,however it does not have any wow factor and therefore requires the green and pink area to be incorporated into a total design philosophy	The document supports the use of the Crescent site for events and activities that will link in with the wider tourism/leisure draw (see Tourism and Leisure Objective A). The "pink" area around Clifford's Fort is still undergoing its refurbishment; there is still a lot to be done including planned public realm works and the refurbishment and reopening of the Old Low Light.
North Tyneside resident	Generally agree	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	1.7 OBJECTIVE A - generally agree	Noted.

North Tyneside resident	1.7 OBJECTIVE B - This is already in conjecture with potential / parking issues / proposals on the W.Quay but could be very workable on a seasonal basis as the visitor season mainly finishes end of October just when the main fishing/prawn season begins. The main fishing season then ends Feb / March just as the main visitor season id starting i.e. WIN / WIN situation.	Car parking and fishing operations could both occur at this site.
North Tyneside resident	OBJECTIVE C Generally agree. May be the people who gain from this could be asked to contribute to the upkeep from lost Council revenue e. g. the so called "village green " (Crescent) which may vastly increase house prices / business turnover of those overlooking it . Also, if necessary, to improve the area some parts of green could be used with consideration given to ensure a a wildlife corridor still remains.	This is not a realistic suggestion.
North Tyneside resident	OBJECTIVE D generally agree. NE RUBBER CO area would be better residential but que sera - maybe Social housing ?	Mixed use could include housing.
North Tyneside resident	OBJECTIVE E I do not think this is feasible unless agreements with landowners is sought.	Planning proposals are not necessarily concerned with ownership.
North Tyneside resident	OBJECTIVE F Agree, OBJECTIVE G currently underway	Noted.

North Tyneside resident	OBJECTIVE H I think this issue has already been included under green space Objective C but agree	This site has its own separate objective to address the desire for its use as a place for temporary events, as well as kept as a green space.
North Tyneside resident	with regard to question about pink at Wooden Doll + car park. Is this to protect the views of residents on the other side of the street ? ie to inhibit any development on the "pub site "including car park. Can this be done without legal agreement of the land owners?	This is suggested as tourism and leisure use because that is the current and preferred future use of this site.
North Tyneside resident	acceptable	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	This is little more than an exercise in 'colouring-in' the spaces. For example... now what colour will we make the top of the bank on Waldo St where the derelict garages are? How about red? If ever a site was utterly unsuitable for housing it is this one.	Site no longer suggested for residential use.
North Tyneside resident	The areas designated for leisure and tourism are inadequate. There is no mention of slipways and there is also no provision for the arts. The areas marked as 'mixed use' should rightly be called 'we dunno'. And the reason the group doesn't know and has resorted to 'colouring in' is that it failed from the outset to engage the	7.1.1 and 7.1.2 mention the kinds of uses leisure and tourism could include - including provision for the arts. The Group do not wish to stifle development, and are keen to embrace a range of suitable uses, so have suggested that several areas for a mix of uses.

	wider community.	
North Tyneside resident	Open spaces are marked in green but they are ALL inaccessible being mostly steep banks. There is little or no provision for younger people.	Noted. Document acknowledges lack of provision for younger people and children and puts forward the suggestion for suitable play facilities.
North Tyneside resident	There is little detail as regards mixed use areas and tourism areas. Is Clifford's fort really a tourist attraction?	The Group do not wish to stifle development, and are keen to embrace a range of suitable uses, so have suggested that several areas for a mix of uses. The Fort and surrounds could attract visitors, especially with the opening of the Heritage Centre.
North Tyneside resident	From this point the area is referred to as the Fish Quay. It should be North Shields Fish Quay throughout.	Document acknowledges the Fish Quay is within North Shields, but needn't repeat it throughout – see paragraph 1.1.
Places for People representative	Agree – would suggest introduction of a designated area for medium stay car park would assist the reader to understand. Also the route of the C2C could be added.	There are lots of things mentioned in the SPD that could be included on the map (C2C, wildlife corridor, recreation route, Scheduled Monument, SSSI, etc...) but trying to keep it simple. UDP map already displays much of these features.
Natural England Representative	The map should identify protected sites. Mapping of ecological sites is an NPPF requirement (paragraph 117).	These features are mapped within the UDP.

Natural England Representative	Objective 1.4.8 should refer to the integration of improvements to the areas living, working and tourist environment with protection and enhancement of the natural environment. Of specific concern is the potential increase in recreational use of the SSSI, SPA and Ramsar as a consequence of residential development within the plan area and tourist developments at the fort and on the seafront (identified as pink on the map)	Noted. Paragraph 1.4.8 now amended to say “alongside improvement to the area’s living, working, leisure and <u>natural</u> environment.”
--------------------------------	--	--

Chapter 2 About Neighbourhood Planning		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	I am entirely in agreement.	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	the number of Policy documents listed serves to highlight the complexity of decision making in what is a small geographical area	Noted.

North Tyneside resident	para 2.1 Why is there a need to have existing planning documents dating back to 2001.2002 and 2005? This appears to go against the objectives of para 2.3 ie simplify the system. para 2.5 and 2.6 again numerous papers - keep it simple!	Planning document don't exist in isolation; they work alongside and supplement others. Those listed in 2.1, although some are several years old, are still the relevant and current suite of planning policy and documents that this one supplements. The discussion in 2.5 and 2.6 was considered important to make it transparent where this SPD sits within planning policy.
North Tyneside resident	I think more priority should be given to demolishing buildings such as the old rubber factory, the ice factory, the Tyne Brand factory, wrather than creating a heritage centre. The removal of these buildings would greatly enhance the looked of the area, & give much needed parking until the sites are developed.	These three sites are highlighted in the document and their redevelopment is encouraged. The creation of a Heritage centre is also encouraged in the document. The two are not mutually exclusive.
North Tyneside resident	I have some concern about local people feathering their own nests ? but suppose that it is natural	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	Neighbourhood planning is very useful, but it needs to be born in mind that each small locality is part of a greater whole. Specifically, the Fish Quay is part of North Tyneside's river and sea waterfront which serves as a lung, with clean air and a place of relaxation and recreation for people from all over the borough and beyond.	Noted. SPD acknowledges wider areas and links to them.

North Tyneside resident	It ought to be easy for people to come to the Fish Quay, by bus, ferry or on foot or bike and from there move on to Tynemouth and beyond, or up to Northumberland Park or Royal Quays, as it should be for residents. too. It should not be essential to have a car to do this easily - many of our people do not have one and costs, pollution and congestion will make many more increasingly keen to have good alternatives to driving.	it is acknowledged that the physical layout of the area means that access can be difficult. Objectives in the Transport and Access chapter promote better access for all.
North Tyneside resident	In theory it's a great idea, but in reality the implementation of it in this case has failed miserably since it has failed to engage local communities. The Group has not been sufficiently proactive in reaching out to the WHOLE community, preferring to hide behind a 'meetings culture' and using language that aims to alienate rather than engage.	A number of consultation exercises have been carried out to involve local people -see relevant section of Cabinet report.
North Tyneside resident	I am broadly in agreement with 'localism' as far as it has been envisaged so far. How many residents of the :North Shields Fish Quay area are involved in this process?	A number of consultation exercises have been carried out to involve local people -see relevant section of Cabinet report.
Places for People representative	Think there should be consideration to surrounding neighbourhood plans. How will the proposals for Fish Quay interact with other key sites in North Shields? How can they support and improve each other? In particular how does the	There are no surrounding neighbourhood plans. SPD has several references to the need to link with surrounding areas of interest such as the town centre and Royal Quays. Also a discussion in the Economy chapter on the need to protect the town centre's vitality.

	neighbourhood sit alongside the town centre, Royal Quay and proposals for Smiths Dock? All of which are within a 5 minute walk so it is inevitable these neighbourhoods can support each other..	Added at paragraphs at 2.8 and 6.2.1 that refer to Smith's Dock development.
--	--	--

Chapter 3 The Fish Quay Neighbourhood Plan SPD		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	I am entirely in agreement. Typo:is safe from flooding and pollution[waste] - remove the brackets from around [from flooding]	Noted. Typo amended.
North Tyneside resident	As long as any new businesses or buildings do not take over from the principal area of fishing.	A key theme throughout the document is the need to retain the very important fishing industry and for it not to be compromised for the sake of other uses.
North Tyneside resident	Vital that dereliction is cleared. The success of the Irwin Building is clear to see. Economic issues highlight the difficulty of regeneration-some of the buildings have been derelict for years. As a visitor to the Fish Quay its one of the first things commented on. Tourism & industry is not an easy mix	Dereliction is cited in the SPD as a major negative factor, and its removal is a key aim. It is hoped that the adoption of this document will give greater clarity and confidence to developers to encourage development at the FQ.

North Tyneside resident	para 3.2.1 - see previous comments on para 1.3 and 1.4. para 3.2.3 - ' the removal of areas of severe dereliction' should this not be the replacemt of.....	See response to previous comment. We believe the "removal" should remain, but the sentence will be amended to make it read better.
North Tyneside resident	I think more priority should be given to demolishing buildings such as the old rubber factory, the ice factory, the Tyne Brand factory, wrather than creating a heritage centre. The removal of these buildings would greatly enhance the looked of the area, & give much needed parking until the sites are developed.	These three sites are highlighted in the document and their redevelopment is encouraged. The creation of a Heritage centre is also encouraged in the document. The two are not mutually exclusive.
North Tyneside resident	3.2.3 I would like to see the following insertion "promotion of sensitive new development and refurbishment..."	Added.
North Tyneside resident	3.3.2 Last sentence is meaningless and needs rephrasing	Deleted.
North Tyneside resident	3.3.3 Car and lorry parking is also a challenge based on physical layout	Amended sentence to make it clear that physical layout affects several factors.
North Tyneside resident	3.3.7.4 The first dot point. I believe the word "allowing" gives the wrong impression. I suggest it should be	Amended as suggested.

	reworded as “Recognising that the fishing industry will continue and is a 24h, 365 day per year activity	
North Tyneside resident	3.1.3 I think FISHcast made some grave errors ,but its easy to criticize after the event	The FISHcast character statement is an adopted document, with Council and public endorsement. We are happy to continue this endorsement now.
North Tyneside resident	3.3.7.2 Ensuring views of the river are not obstructed re Pyeroy site If trees can be cut at the bottom of the bankside to allow for building then more trees from the top end could be cut down to open up the views that existed since Dockwray Square was originally built about 200 years ago and which should be considered a vital heritage aspect. and would encourage foot visitors / tourism along the bank top to the Fish Quay via the stairways thus easing a very congested Fish QUAY. A wildlife corridor could still be left with views over the top A WIN WIN situation. Could maybe say PUBLIC views which generally covers private views as well	The Banksides Management Strategy (that this SPD supports) addresses the need to maintain balance between views and biodiversity in the area. "Public" will be added to the text.
North Tyneside resident	3.1.3 Add as 5th bullet point: Promotes the health, physical, mental and social, of those who live and work there	New bullet added “Enhances the health and happiness of residents, workers and visitors”

<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>There is a new dereliction in the area and the cause of this has been the regeneration. How many empty offices and small business units are there?? Answer... many! The idea that visitors and businesses will flock into any area that stinks of fish and where car parking is at a premium is pie in the sky.</p>	<p>The Group believe that visitors and business do come to the area.</p>
<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>Sustainability is nothing more than a buzz word used by marketers. And what is sustainability? And why must we have it? NOTHING lasts forever. Clinging onto the fish industry, which historically has had NO notion of sustainability will simply keep the area just as it is now. A mess. If the fishing sector were to leave to a more suitable location then there is a chance that some of the plan might just work.</p>	<p>The Group believe the fishing industry is vital to the character and future success of the area.</p>
<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>More gobbledegook with little detail. The main problem is that the area is getting overcrowded and full of litter already.</p>	<p>noted.</p>

Environment Agency	<p>Future development within the North Shields Fish Quay Area should address any land contamination risks. We support reference to the issue of land contamination within the draft neighbourhood plan. For example, land contamination could potentially be addressed within Section 3.3: Challenges and Section 4: Design Principles (4.1 Introduction and 4.2 Context and Character) of the draft neighbourhood plan. For sites where the historical uses are potentially contaminative, an assessment of whether the sites pose a risk to controlled waters including ground, surface and transitional waters will need to be made as part of any development proposal.</p>	Reference added 3.3.3
Natural England Representative	<p>Paragraph 3.1.3 refers to environment and sustainability. However it focuses on economic sustainability and co-existence of those living and working in the area. The plan should reflect the three pillars of sustainable development (as set out in the NPP) and include the protection and enhancing of the natural environment.</p>	Bullet point: "Protects and enhances the natural environment" added to list.

Chapter 4: Design Principles		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	I am entirely in agreement. Page 22 "roofline that is characterised the Fish Quay area" insert "in"	Noted. Typo amended.
North Tyneside resident	Any buildings that go up in the Fish Quay area should have a connection in that a pattern on them such as Fishing Boat, Trailing Nets, Fishermen, etc. This would mean that thought has been taken to build around the area with the Fish Quay and Fishermen being the principal meaning of this area and to remain that way.	The Group would not encourage "Disneyfication" of the Fish Quay. This is a real area, with real buildings that do not require fake motifs to illustrate that it is a fishing area. The <i>real</i> river, boats, fishermen, sheds, processing units and the area's name are sufficient evidence that this is a fishing area.
North Tyneside resident	Emphasis on Fishing important in design of new buildings & simplicity rather than parody of the past should be encouraged. Views of the river & access to it are vital.	Pastiche old-style buildings would not be encouraged. Line added to emphasise this at 4.2.2 "Pastiche old design, that is, design that imitates being old, will generally not be supported." Preservation and creation of new views are encouraged in design guidelines.
North Tyneside resident	4.1.2: Why is access restricted.? Pedestrian pathways should be the norm, not the exception.	Some previous riverfront development has restricted access to the river front. The Group have included this line in the SPD to ensure this does not happen with future development.
North Tyneside resident	4.7.1 Nothing wrong with "fluid" design. I believe it wrong to stifle creativity	This area is made up of angular, blocky buildings; a fluid-shaped building may not always be suitable within this context. Added "usually".

North Tyneside resident	4.1.3 See general comment on “case by case” v. “strategic development”	Paragraph rewritten to be clearer in its intention.
North Tyneside resident	4.3.3 Should read “vantage” points not “advantage” points	Amended.
North Tyneside resident	4.4 Perhaps consideration should be given to having a 20mph limit. Traffic calming should recognise the extensive use of fork lift trucks to move fish and so should not be the cause of increased noise levels from this source or spillage of goods	FQNP Objective G: "North Tyneside Council is requested to carry out a review of the current traffic and vehicle parking problems and potential solutions, with the involvement of the FQNP Group or local representatives." looks towards the relevant teams within the Council to tackle the traffic issues.
North Tyneside resident	4.4.9 With increased residential occupation of the area a river taxi landing stage could be used for commuter river buses to central Newcastle	River taxi mentioned as a potential access solution.

North Tyneside resident	p.22 Regarding the Upton, Northampton development, I have specific experience of a similar development. High buildings, narrow streets, alleys and home zone principles can result in anti social behaviour and crime. They have to be designed with police guidance (see page 26 also).The sketch on the left hand side recognises the distinctive shape of the old Tyne Brand Building, a shape that is universally recognised by those of a certain age. Its regard to heritage should be an example of good practice	Noted. These are just sketches that point out various elements that could/could not work at the Fish Quay.
North Tyneside resident	4.5.3 The Tyne Brand Development should not be overbearing on the green space of the Crescent site or interrupt open views of the river, Cliffords Fort and Fish Quay as the area is approached from Tanners Lane or Brewhouse Bank. It should therefore not be developed such that it is built up to the site boundary with Tanners Bank/Union Quay and the front elevation should be limited in height. It must also not swamp the Low Lights Public House	The design guidelines set out that existing views should protected and enhanced. The Low Lights Tavern is a listed building and as such, regard has to be given to its setting. Also see 4.8.3
North Tyneside resident	4.5.4 Why does this only apply to buildings above 5 storeys? It should be a general principle	This point is discussing five storeys as an exception (see 4.5.2), so applying it generally doesn't work.

North Tyneside resident	4.5.5 Suggest Irvin Building and Low Lights Pub be included as landmark buildings	There are many landmark buildings in the area, it's not appropriate to list them all.
North Tyneside resident	4.6.1 Why create “focal points on corners?” There is no precedent for this in the area so why is it introduced?	Creating features at corners, thus creating legibility, is a general principle of good design. It may not always be appropriate. Changed “should” to “could”.
North Tyneside resident	4.7.1 Why is “angular and blocky” recommended? This requirement will restrain an architectural opportunity to produce an iconic development. The Brightblue Studio planning permission gives something of a precedent	This area is made up of angular, blocky buildings; a fluid-shaped building may not always be suitable within this context. Added “usually”.
North Tyneside resident	4.9.3 Other than the distinctively shaped smoke houses, timber cladding has no precedent in the area, would look false and pretentious and could age quickly in the hostile environment. There is a conflict with 4.9.4 on a need to harmonise with nearby development	Added "where appropriate"
North Tyneside resident	4.10 Should include a requirement for rainwater recycling and minimising the use of energy through high insulation, double glazing etc.	Council’s adopted Sustainable Development and Construction Guide (2007) and Design Quality SPD (2010) address these issues and they are referred to.

RIBA representative	<p>Suggested text to add..."Design Quality, The NPPF states that local planning authorities should have local design review arrangements in place. The purpose of the design review is to provide constructive, impartial and expert guidance to applicants as they develop their proposals to ensure high standards of design. Design Review for schemes in North Tyneside will be undertaken for the Council by the North East Design Review and Enabling Service (NE DRES) the regional design support service. Where the council believes that a development would benefit from design review then applicants will be informed during pre-application discussions. North Tyneside Council will have regard to the recommendations of the design review and how these have been reflected in the submitted design when determining the application."</p>	<p>Whilst we note the work of the Design Review Service, we do not think it is necessary to describe the service in the SPD.</p>
North Tyneside resident	<p>I generally agree with these noble design principals,developers should buy into an overall design philosophy. The traffic on Union Quay requires positive control with enforced penalties for double parking outside fast food outlets</p>	<p>FQNP Objective G: "North Tyneside Council is requested to carry out a review of the current traffic and vehicle parking problems and potential solutions, with the involvement of the FQNP Group or local representatives." looks towards the relevant teams within the Council to tackle the traffic and parking issues.</p>

North Tyneside resident	The fish quay itself needs to be opened up to view from the eating establishments along the Quay. The solid wall between the fish quay and the adjoining roadway nullifies the proximity of the fishing boats and the activity of the harbour. There is no visual connection between the fishing boats and the Fish Quay area. The solid wall needs to be replaced, or at least pierced, by iron railings.	Noted. This would be covered under 4.3.4 "Dramatic new viewing opportunities should be created."
North Tyneside resident	4.2.5 Again Dockwray Square historic views impaired.	The Banksides Management Strategy (that this SPD supports) addresses the need to maintain balance between views and biodiversity in the area. 4.3.3 discusses retention of views.
North Tyneside resident	4.2.9 agree	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	4.3.1 not re bankside views, 4.3.2 not re bankside views	The Banksides Management Strategy (that this SPD supports) addresses the need to maintain balance between views and biodiversity in the area. 4.3.3 discusses retention of views.
North Tyneside resident	4.3.3 definitely agree	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	4.3.4 disagree with slot views whole views as has existed for many years should remain	The quayside, in several areas, has long been built up, without wide views.

North Tyneside resident	4.4.1 agree, 4.4.9 long term, 4.5.4 agree	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	4.5.5 old blue ice tower needs to be removed by owner	“Ice Factory” removed from sentence – it suggested we’d like to see its retention, which we don’t. We would support it’s removal and replacement with a suitable development.
CTC, the national cycling charity	It would have been good to see cycling mentioned under Ease of Movement	Point added to support cycle access and parking at 4.4.3
North Tyneside resident	4.4.3 add ..Metro, Tynemouth, Northumberland Park and Royal Quays.	"and other local points of interest" added – not appropriate to always list all possible places.
North Tyneside resident	4.10.3 and the possibility of ground source heating should be explored.	This is covered as part of 4.10.2 “Being designed and constructed, where appropriate, in accordance with the guidelines set out in North Tyneside Council’s adopted Sustainable Development and Construction Guide (2007) and Design Quality SPD (2010).”

North Tyneside resident	<p>The whole area currently is a hodge podge of architectural styles and attempting to lay down 'design principals' is impossibly difficult. New designs and alterations to buildings can only be judged on their merits on the day and that is what will happen. Reading through 4.2 was highly entertaining... not quite good enough for Private Eye's 'Pseuds Corner', but getting there; particularly 4.2.6, 4.2.8 and 4.2.9. Surely a joke!! Writing in plain English is a skill which the writers of the NP clearly don't have. What on earth does 4.3.4 mean?? I have no idea. And what is 4.3.5 all about... ensuring the knowledge isn't lost?? The bottom line is that clear views should be retained, that green spaces should be accessible by PEOPLE.</p>	<p>This hasn't been an issue raised by others, including the independent "critical friend" who was working on behalf of Planning Aid England.</p>
North Tyneside resident	<p>Moving about the area is difficult as there are too many cars, not enough parking spaces and poor public transport. All these issues could be solved if the fish sector went elsewhere. A river taxi? To where exactly?? Newcastle and Gateshead... a mere 60 minutes away. Sadly the group failed to see the obvious answer... a cablecar or funicular railway linking to a new Metro station to be located at the top of Tanners Bank!</p>	<p>The SPD does suggest a range of possible public transport options including a river taxi, a funicular and a new Metro station. It is acknowledged that developments such as this are unlikely to happen in the short term.</p>

North Tyneside resident	4.5 generally good but what on earth is 4.5.4??	This is a way of describing an exception rather than a rule. It appears to have been generally understood.
North Tyneside resident	4.6 good	noted
North Tyneside resident	4.7 - what does 4.7.1 mean?	It appears to have been generally understood.
North Tyneside resident	4.8 and 4.9 good	noted.
North Tyneside resident	4.10 I do not understand	Some word changes.

North Tyneside resident	The proposals are general and acceptable. The devil is in the detail. The height of new development has long been an issue. The vista belongs to everybody and not just to those rich enough to lock themselves into their riverside developments. The Fish Quay is part of North Shields. The present riverside housing is a ghetto blocking North Shields off from its river.	Design principles recognise the importance of shared views.
Places for People representative	'Respect for what has gone before' is important but it is also vital that design is allowed to look forward. An example of new and old working together is demonstrated perfectly at Brewery Bond or the Wills Building (Coast Road).	Reference to "good quality modern design" added at 4.2.2
Places for People representative	The use of glass to reflect the River Tyne is a material which is not mentioned within this section and one which I believe would be a huge asset.	Section 4.9 supports diversity in materials and modern materials; it's not appropriate to list each potential one.

Places for People representative	Creating iconic design can attract visitors to an area. The Sage and the Angel of the North are examples of pushing the design boundaries, which in a relatively short period of time have become huge attractions and financially benefited their area. Design for the Fish Quay should not be too restrictive.	Appropriate, iconic design is not discouraged.
Natural England Representative	Design principles should include the incorporation of natural greenspaces where appropriate and the use of native species. This will assist in achieving an increase in biodiversity and an attractive environment for residents and visitors.	Point added at 4.10.4

Chapter 5 Economy		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	I am entirely in agreement. 5.4.1 should be "principal" not "principle".	Noted. Typo amended.
North Tyneside resident	It is so important to manage money cautiously but at the same time enhance - it can and should be done!!	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	vital to support the fishing industry & the small business units. The restaurants & cafes bring vital life & amenity to the area. Not easy to support a 24 hour business like fishing in an area of fairly	Noted.

	up-market housing	
North Tyneside resident	Would like to see some incentives to help small businesses.	Noted. As a planning document, by encouraging such uses, this SPD supports small business in the planning process.
North Tyneside resident	5.1.5 What evidence to support this 5 for 1 in jobs. This type of statistic is frequently used without support. Nor does it indicate if the jobs are local or elsewhere in country.	As explained in 5.1.8 "As no suitable data on jobs and values from official sources could always be found, most figures provided in paragraphs 5.1.5 to 5.1.7 were calculated by Group members who represented the small to medium sized businesses within the area."
North Tyneside resident	5.2.6 Increasing housing justifies increase in late night venues. Dont agree with keeping venue numbers as is.	There are six public houses within the SPD boundary, and at least two others just outside. Most large, more conventional, housing estates have one or two, if at all. The population and potential future population are considered well served for evening venues at the Fish Quay.
North Tyneside resident	5.3 objective D: any reason fro excluding hotel development?	Hotel development is not excluded, in planning terms in falls into "C uses", which are residential in nature. Have changed "housing" to "residential" to make it clearer.

North Tyneside resident	Appears OK	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	5.1.3 The fishing industry also benefits from its strategic location that allows it to operate as a transit/ transfer hub for fish that is not caught locally but throughout the north east and Scotland. This fact explains the financial data in 5.1.4	Added.
North Tyneside resident	5.1.6 I assume that the numbers are number of jobs in which case this should be stated	Amended.
North Tyneside resident	5.4.8 "North Shields." typo. It may also help to point out that North Shields town centre is around 1(?) mile from Fish Quay	Typo amended. The Fish Quay is very linear and covers a large space so a measure of distance to the town centre wouldn't be accurate for most of the area.
North Tyneside resident	5.4.9 At end of first sentence it should read "increased demand."	Amended.
North Tyneside resident	5.1.3 A forecast of how the fishing industry is likely to go over the next 5-10years would be very helpful to aid planning	Information from the Fish Quay Company and other business in the area suggests we should support fishing's continued presence in this area for the foreseeable future.
North Tyneside resident	5.3 Already under conjecture re parking on the West Quay	Car parking and fishing operations could both occur at this site.

North Tyneside resident	Since many factors which influence deep sea fishing are outside local control it may be appropriate to bear in mind that inshore line fishing is becoming a valued source of supplies by some up-market restaurants and that leisure fishing is also growing in popularity. Facilities for these aspects of the industry may become of growing importance in the future.	noted.
North Tyneside resident	I do not believe that 460 people are employed full time in the fishing industry. I am informed that only 10% of fish sold locally is actually landed here. Fish Quay is a distribution point NOT a landing point. The fish industry is smelly, noisy and dwindling daily mostly due to over fishing and that as a nation we don't eat fresh fish. Find the fish industry a new, purpose built home with good road links and the local economy will improve; keep it as it is, where it is and prepare for failure.	As explained in 5.1.8 "As no suitable data on jobs and values from official sources could always be found, most figures provided in paragraphs 5.1.5 to 5.1.7 were calculated by Group members who represented the small to medium sized businesses within the area."
North Tyneside resident	In the present economic climate it does not make sense to speculate on future usage. There seems to be a lot of empty capacity already.	noted.
Places for People representative	No reference to employment opportunities for young people. Without recruitment and training of younger people the fishing industry will eventually suffer and the long term aims	Added at 5.2.4 "Continued success in the employment uses at the Fish Quay are also important to ensure the young people of the area have job opportunities. We would expect that businesses promote local recruitment and

	of the area will not be sustained.	offer training to ensure a strong, skilled, local workforce"
Places for People representative	Support mix of uses across the area.	Noted.

Chapter 6 Transport and Accessibility		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	I am entirely in agreement. 6.3.2 "s" should be added to "tourist".	Noted. Typo amended.

<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>To relieve parking problems there should be a motorised train (like in Paris and other tourist place)as the Fish Quay should become a tourist attaction as well as a working area. This train should ride between Whitley Bay St. Mary's lighthouse right along the seafront, Cullercoats, Tynemouth Front Street and on to the Quayside. People could park in between any of those areas in the knowledge that a regular motorised train ride is regularly accessible. Allowing a sensible low fare - more people would use this faciliity and relieve overparking in the Quayside area. This train could run most of the year but certainly between March and November. Think of the money that this could bring in. You would need more than one train though!!!</p>	<p>Transport and Accessibility Objective E encourages public transport systems that link the FQ with the North Tyneside coast.</p>
<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>Access is poor, parking is messy & approaches (steps) can be overgrown with brambles & dangerous with wet leaves & ill maintained surfaces. the steps are very steep.I generally walk down from N Shields & along to Tynemouth (a lovely walk always enjoyed by visitors who dont know the area) & then return via metro or bus or walk along Kinf Edward Road & Linskill terrace. People generally do not walk far & thus park on Union street & Bell street rather than in the car park near tyo the restaurants & cafes.</p>	<p>Issues with the parking and access are recognised in the SPD and objectives put forward to alleviate those issues.</p>

North Tyneside resident	One way system on FQ would improve situation	FQNP Objective G: "North Tyneside Council is requested to carry out a review of the current traffic and vehicle parking problems and potential solutions, with the involvement of the FQNP Group or local representatives." looks towards the relevant teams within the Council to tackle the traffic issues.
North Tyneside resident	Appears OK	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	Perhaps making the road along the fish quay one way, narrowing the road, & increasing the width of the pavement would help the "cafe culture" of the area. Opening up the Smiths Dock road to the A19 can only help, the sooner the better.	FQNP Objective G: "North Tyneside Council is requested to carry out a review of the current traffic and vehicle parking problems and potential solutions, with the involvement of the FQNP Group or local representatives." looks towards the relevant teams within the Council to tackle the traffic issues. Transport and Accessibility Objective B supports the early opening of the Smith's Dock route.
North Tyneside resident	6.1.3 Charging at the foreshore car park encourages on-street parking	FQNP Objective G: "North Tyneside Council is requested to carry out a review of the current traffic and vehicle parking problems and potential solutions, with the involvement of the FQNP Group or local representatives." looks towards the relevant teams within the Council to tackle the traffic and parking issues.
North Tyneside resident	6.2.7 A landing point would allow visitors to arrive by boat on a down river pleasure cruise and with the expected increase in the residential population, a commuter's river bus to central Newcastle could be a	See Transport and Accessibility Objective E and 4.4.9

	possibility (potential use of S106 money?)	
North Tyneside resident	Traffic movement and parking is key to this whole area and future development,if this not handled with utmost care then it could drive away the people you are trying to attract	FQNP Objective G: "North Tyneside Council is requested to carry out a review of the current traffic and vehicle parking problems and potential solutions, with the involvement of the FQNP Group or local representatives." looks towards the relevant teams within the Council to tackle the traffic and parking issues.
Fish Quay employer	6.3.2 To be frank, it's not a realistic objective; it would conflict massively with industry operations and in my opinion its inclusion is a distraction likely to raise false hopes. I would recommend consideration be given to deleting it.	Objective deleted.

Nexus representative	<p>Nexus would support the need to improve public transport accessibility in any substantial redevelopment of the area. We note the proposals for a new Metro station, and a relocated ferry landing. These are certainly interesting proposals and probably technically feasible, but would have very substantial budget implications, which Nexus is not likely to be able to meet in the foreseeable future; therefore funds would have to be sought from development contributions or other external funds. These proposals may also have transport scheduling implications which could lead to the need for new trains, for example. Improvements to bus access to the Fish Quay would be more straightforward to deliver, although again potentially having a funding requirement. Should the FQNP/DSPD proposals move forward in future to a more 'concrete' stage, we would welcome early consultation with Nexus about public transport opportunities.</p>	<p>Ferry objective deleted. There is an acceptance within the SPD at 6.2.12 that the Metro suggestion may not be possible. However as aspirations that have been raised by the community, it was deemed suitable to make mention of them as potential developments in the long term future. An improvement in bus access is advocated in the SPD and it would be the case that such opportunities be discussed and possibly brought forward at a planning application stage, with this document as a guide/support in that process.</p>
North Tyneside resident	<p>My house is right next to Brewhouse Bank, which currently has high volume of traffic including HGVs - I support the re-routing of the HGV traffic away from Brewhouse Bank.</p>	<p>The installation of a riverside link road in this area has been an objective of North Tyneside Council since the adoption of the UDP in 2002 (policy T6/1) and is being delivered as part of the redevelopment of the Smiths Dock. As the SPD has no power to control use of the road, references in the document relating to that will be removed. Use of the road is solely a matter</p>

		for the Highways team.
North Tyneside resident	<p>There is a feeling that movement of heavy goods traffic along this area of the quay and thro Smiths Dock would not work firstly this area is much more residential area and there would definately have to be restrictions for the time of deliveries to begin and the morning and finish in the afternoon as well as weekends to be considered. Also all the working for these vehicles is at the other end of the quay. There will be problems with access and egress to our building due to the wait for the gate to open. We would need to be able to use the bus turning circle whilst waiting for this to happen. The footpath just outside our building would need to be widened as a safety measure for pedestrians if heavy goods go past. Due to the fact that it is impossible to see any on-coming traffic whilst leaving the building some measures would have to be put in place by Highways to avoid any accidents occuring. I note that they Neighbourhood Plan talks about going thro Smiths Dock and link in with the A19 corridor.</p>	<p>The installation of a link road in this area has been an objective of North Tyneside Council since the adoption of the UDP in 2002 (policy T6/1) and is being delivered as part of the redevelopment of the Smiths Dock. Therefore this SPD does not propose the road, it merely supports its opening. As the SPD has no power to control use of the road, references in the document relating to that will be removed. Use of the road is solely a matter for the Highways team. We will pass on your concerns to them.</p>

	<p>All the residents in Brewery Bond are aware of the great difficulties that were encountered by Valker Steven when they were clearing Smiths Dock. Dock Road is not very wide and the roundabout at the top is quite small. One of the problems encountered on a daily basis by the heavy goods clearing Smiths Dock was it was necessary for a Banksman to be available for these vehicles as a safety measure due to the businesses and local residents who live in that area. I can't think that any of the vehicles would have a Banksman available on a daily basis but it is something which needs to be addressed. I hope you will take these objections in the manner they are sent and will be considered in the preparation of the final Draft.</p>	
North Tyneside resident	6.2 Suggest double yellow lines on Brewhouse Bank / Bird St. both sides	Highways issue currently being addressed via URS Access Study.
North Tyneside resident	6.2.1 HGV + R tics tend to use Borough Bank as opposed to Brewhouse Bank	References to HGVs movement removed.
North Tyneside resident	6.2.11 some views obscured by trees	The Banksides Management Strategy (that this SPD supports) addresses the need to maintain balance between views and biodiversity in the area.
North Tyneside	6.3.1 Objective b and c agree	Noted.

resident		
North Tyneside resident	6.3.2 W Quay parking would enhance this possibility	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	<p>paragraph 6.2.1., which proposes a through route along Bell Street and Liddell Street via New Quay and through the former Smith's Dock area towards the A19 corridor for HGV's accessing the Fish Quay's industrial premises. We find this proposal completely unacceptable, especially in the absence of any estimate of current or future traffic volumes. To send 44-tonne vehicles along the proposed route 24 hours a day, past the existing and proposed high-density residential accommodation along Clive Street, New Quay and Duke Street, as well as the proposed residential development at Smiths Dock, will be detrimental to the amenity of many households. Especially so as much of the traffic is at night, and will thus create a much worse noise nuisance in this quiet residential area. There is also a risk of heavy traffic causing damage to environmentally-sensitive buildings.</p>	<p>The installation of a link road in this area has been an objective of North Tyneside Council since the adoption of the UDP in 2002 (policy T6/1) and is being delivered as part of the redevelopment of the Smiths Dock. Therefore this SPD does not propose the road, it merely supports its opening. As the SPD has no power to control use of the road, references in the document relating to that will be removed. Use of the road is solely a matter for the Highways team. We will pass on your concerns to them.</p>

	<p>In addition, the proposal runs counter to the aim of improving the visitor experience of the Fish Quay itself, since heavy vehicles will continue to use Union Quay, conflicting with pedestrians and cyclists in the very heart of the Fish Quay. It would be far better to send them up Tanners Bank and on to Tynemouth Road, thus avoiding both the Fish Quay restaurant area and the Town Centre. We note too that the FQAS Report contains a proposal to close Clifford Street. If this comes about it will be even more logical for HGV's to use the Tanners Bank route.</p>	
North Tyneside resident	<p>The other proposal we find unacceptable is that the Shields ferry landing should be moved nearer to the Fish Quay. This would be much less convenient to the Town Centre and would not cater for the extra demand which will be created by the Smiths Dock development, not to mention making the ferry transit much longer and thus potentially reducing its frequency while increasing its cost.</p>	Ferry objective deleted.
North Tyneside resident	<p>The URS access study on traffic movement, parking, public transport will endorse our views that there is a conflict of interests, residents and perhaps above all, present and future visitors. Indeed, on 16th Feb 2013 (day of drop-in) the build-up of traffic and take-up of parking (legal and illegal) was demonstrated at a high</p>	<p>Noted. The URS study recognises the issues at the Fish Quay and the opportunities to improve the situation to ensure better traffic movement, access and parking.</p>

	level near Clifford's Fort.	
North Tyneside resident	I suggest the excellent looking spine road through to Smiths Dock should not be believed now to be a way through for HGVs and commercial vehicles.	The installation of a link road in this area has been an objective of North Tyneside Council since the adoption of the UDP in 2002 (policy T6/1) and is being delivered as part of the redevelopment of the Smiths Dock. As the SPD has no power to control use of the road, references in the document relating to that will be removed. Use of the road is solely a matter for the Highways team.
North Tyneside resident	The idea that new commercial interests can be encouraged to come to the area and the existing industries can be expanded are surely greatly inhibited by the totally inadequate road infrastructure.	There are parking issues that we hope can be alleviated through the recommendations of the URS study. The road infrastructure seems adequate. Any proposed development that would see greatly increased visitor/traffic movement would be assessed through the development management process. Where adverse impacts could occur, the proposal would not be supported.
CTC, the national cycling charity	6.1.5. The C2C (Coast to Coast) cycle route should be C2C (Sea to Sea) cycle route	Amended.
CTC, the national cycling charity	6.2.2. Cycle parking could also be included	Added.

<p>CTC, the national cycling charity</p>	<p>6.2.9 Mention of cyclist and routes is welcomed</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>The emphasis given to pedestrian and cycle routes is very welcome and requires to central to the development of the FQ as a leisure/pleasure attraction. A well enforced speed limit of a maximum of 20mph wider pavements and clear priority crossing places for those on foot are essential- those who arrive by motorised transport nearly all have to walk across roads to get to their destinations and so everyone must be aware that at present the position is not satisfactory!</p>	<p>New Transport and Accessibility Objective B added "To encourage the improvement of pedestrian and disabled access in the Fish Quay."</p>

<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>There is no mention of the needs of people with disabilities in this (or any other section i think.) Those with mobility problems are at a particular disadvantage, to some extent due to the topography of the area, but one area that must be remedied is the restoration of the path, mentioned in 7.2.8, between Oxford St car park in Tynemouth to behind the Low Lights Car park. The gradient is moderate and the surface is not too bad until it reaches steps which lead down to the cars. The accessible route should to carry straight on, but the path is badly maintained and passes alongside a business, called AND which seems to have extended it's fence to narrow the path. making it unusable by a wheel chair - and when its gate is open, making it is most difficult for anyone to pass. i believe this path is on the Rights of Way map and at one time was sign-posted from the road, as it should be. This route would be the easiest path from FQ to Tynemouth and offers some shelter from the wind on a rough day, This obstruction has been reported and it is essential that remedial action is carried out.</p>	<p>Consideration of disabled persons' needs are mentioned at various points in the document. Also new Transport and Accessibility Objective B added "To encourage the improvement of pedestrian and disabled access in the Fish Quay." Thank you for reporting right of way issues.</p>
--	--	---

North Tyneside resident	There is insufficient parking since everything is concentrated down by the Fish market. The plan does not offer a solution. A metro station at the top of Tanners Bank linked by a tramway, light railway or similar that ran from a new station and linked up to Royal Quays via Smiths Dock would be a master stroke.	The SPD calls upon the Council to seek better parking and access arrangements in the area. A Study has recently been drawn up by URS with potential solutions for these issues. A new Metro station, etc. is suggested in the SPD but it is acknowledged that they are probably financially unfeasible in the foreseeable future.
North Tyneside resident	The North Shields Fish Quay on a sunny weekend is overcrowded and dangerous for pedestrians. Park and Ride before more car parking. The idea for a riverside pedestrian/cycling route from Royal Quays is great.	The SPD calls upon the Council to seek better parking and access arrangements in the area. A Study has recently been drawn up by URS with potential solutions for these issues.
Places for People representative	6.2.1 – What environmental consequences are you referring too?	Paragraph has been completely rewritten and this reference no longer features.
Places for People representative	6.2.8 – Inclusion of Smiths Dock	Added.
Places for People representative	6.3.2 – Strongly disagree with the moving of the ferry landing. The current position is a midpoint which NTC have agreed will help link Fish Quay, New Quay, Smiths Dock and Royal Quay.	Ferry objective deleted.

Chapter 7 Tourism and Leisure		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	I am entirely in agreement. 7.1.4 - some names need capital letters. 7.2.1 - "bars" should have a small letter	Noted. Typos amended.
North Tyneside resident	See my comments above. In the future planning I feel strongly that the promenade at Briardene should be extended to join St. Mary's lighthouse and would also prevent the cliffs at the mini golf course from eroding away as they are doing. Also going south the promenade should not stop at the Boardwalk but continue round the bay to eventually join the promenade at the Quayside. Then the motorised train could run mostly on promenades and not main roads. However in Paris the trains run on the towns roads so it is all very possible.	The Whitley Bay area is not within the boundaries of this SPD so we are unable to guide development there. This comment has been passed on to Peter Slegg who is the Planning Officer dealing with the Coastal Area Action Plan, for his records.
North Tyneside resident	Arts development is an interesting idea & the Fish Quay could be the right part of N Shields to do it. It should not be elitist however. Agrre with idea to incorporate events into the Mouth of the Tyne Festival. Much as I enjoyed the music at the WOW festivals in the past I never enjoyed the lack of pedestrian space at the Quay	Noted.

North Tyneside resident	Appears OK	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	Perhaps making the road along the fish quay one way, narrowing the road, & increasing the width of the pavement would help the "cafe culture" of the area. Opening up the Smiths Dock road to the A19 can only help, the sooner the better.	FQNP Objective G: "North Tyneside Council is requested to carry out a review of the current traffic and vehicle parking problems and potential solutions, with the involvement of the FQNP Group or local representatives." looks towards the relevant teams within the Council to tackle the traffic issues. Transport and Accessibility Objective B supports the early opening of the Smith's Dock route.
North Tyneside resident	7.2.1 In second bracket "Bars" is the only example starting with a capital letter	Amended.
North Tyneside resident	7.2.6 An idea would be to advertise Fish Quay at the entrance to the ferry port. Early arrivals for the ferry might be tempted to explore a nearby local tourist facility	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	7.2.9 Although stated elsewhere it may be worth pointing out the need for a public shelter in the event of inclement weather	Tourism and Leisure Objective H added to give support to a suitable shelter and justification added at 7.4.4.
North Tyneside resident	7.3.1 Objective A should be more definitive. Suggest something of the form "It is recommended...." Objective E should include shelter facilities	Amended to be more definitive. Tourism and Leisure Objective H added to give support to a suitable shelter and justification added at 7.4.4.

North Tyneside resident	7.3.3 Objective K could include the 6.2.7 comments on a jetty landing stage (6.2.7 A landing point would allow visitors to arrive by boat on a down river pleasure cruise and with the expected increase in the residential population, a commuter's river bus to central Newcastle could be a possibility (potential use of S106 money?))	The intention was not to suggest a landing stage, but more for pedestrian/anglers use. Objective made clearer with addition of "(not for landing)".
North Tyneside resident	Not sure if a cinema or bowling alley would be appropriate that is more for the center itself. A cafe society is more the culture to aspire to	Bowling alley removed but small scale cinema could be acceptable here.
North Tyneside resident	7.3 agree all	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	Maybe in this economic time Tyne Brand could be flattened, tiered and caravans put thereon - a quick relatively cheap solution and develop as South Shields foreshore Sandhaven i.e.. a "caravan park ". or the road adjacent part with hoardings moved back used,with owners agreement as, a charged car park.	We don't feel this would be a viable solution for the site. Nor would it contribute to the housing need for North Tyneside.
CTC, the national cycling charity	7.2.7, 4th bullet, Coast to Coast Cycle Route should be Sea to Sea Cycle Route	Amended.

<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>The idea that 'tourists' will come to the area is utterly deluded. Visitors will come for cheap ale, cheap food and fish and chips and nothing else. The idea of a Heritage Centre promoting the 'extraordinary heritage' of the area is laughable. People will visit once and that'll be it! There was a fort, it's not there any longer, there was a fishing industry which again isn't there any longer and further up the river there was ship building. Truth is, and this is backed up by visitor numbers at the two Roman sites locally, that people want to look forward rather than backwards, and who can blame them. Working and living in North Shelds in days past was dreadful. It was rough, tough and poor and people died young. And as for activities on the quay for all ages... like what? In the plan the quay is marked as 'fishing industry', there is no slippage just a bleak quayside from which folk can fish.</p>	<p>Fishing, walking, eating, shopping, drinking, enjoying the views...the Group feel there are a lot of activities for people to enjoy in the area. This should be increased with the opening of the Heritage Centre. The SPD also puts forward the suggestion of the play park for children.</p>
<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>The Fish Quay is a natural area for the arts, due to its ambience. The site is a great location for artists, given the natural light and unique spaces in the urban form." What?</p>	<p>Sentence amended to "The Fish Quay is a great location for artists, due to its ambience and natural beauty"</p>

Places for People representative	7.1.2 What impact will the introduction of a health and fitness centre have on the councils park centre?	Health and fitness centres can take many forms and needn't have any impact on The Parks centre.
Places for People representative	Similar comments to Chapter 2 – linking neighbouring communities will increase local footfall. The introduction of a 'promenade' linking all areas will encourage simple outdoor pursuits such as walking, cycling, running etc.	Agreed, and advocated throughout SPD.
Places for People representative	7.1.5 Introducing a 'food' or 'craft' festival celebrating the fishing port should be introduced and supported	Agreed - several different festivals, fairs, etc. could be suitable here, as advocated in 7.1.5 and in chapter's objectives.
Places for People representative	7.2.1 Agree – it is vital that the area is well maintained and kept clean to give a positive impression of the area.	noted.
Places for People representative	7.2.10 – 'the site is a great location for artists, given the natural light and unique spaces' What is meant by this?	Sentence amended to "The Fish Quay is a great location for artists, due to its ambience and natural beauty"
Natural England Representative	Paragraphs 7.1.3 and 7.2.3 both refer to Fish Quay Sand's (part of the Northumbria shore SSSI) tourism opportunities. These opportunities should only be promoted and approved if they comply with NPPF paragraph 118: <i>"proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an</i>	Sentence added at 7.2.3: "Due to the sands being within a Site of Special Scientific Interest, proposals will have to demonstrate that they will have no adverse affect on the site's notified special interest features."

	<p><i>adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted.</i></p> <p><i>Where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest"</i></p> <p>This policy approach should be recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
--	--	--

Chapter 8 Residential		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	<p>I am entirely in agreement. Page 53, Photo is of Riverside Quays not Court Photo is of Union Stairs not Bedford Court - Bedford Court is to the left of that photo. Page 55, pic no 7 shows former Lillie & Gillie site, not factory. The factory has been demolished .</p>	<p>Noted. Photo captions amended.</p>

North Tyneside resident	Although I think there should be a good mix - I feel that there is quite a lot of residential areas already in this area and perhaps more tourist type businesses would be more appropriate to entice those out of the area to visit. I still think the present residential buildings should have on them references to the Fish Quay.	The SPD's suggested mix of uses tries to create a good balance. Whilst the need for tourism related business is recognised, the Borough requires growth in housing. Housing development brings about wider benefits such as Section 106 monies and removal of dereliction - these in themselves would contribute to a more attractive visitor environment. By suggesting areas of "mixed use" the SPD allows for a variety of uses to come forward, rather than just residential.
North Tyneside resident	Would imagine that redevelopment of Tyne Brand site would be very expensive & maybe not viable in present economic climate	Noted. This SPD aims to provide clarity and confidence to developers to encourage development coming forward.

North Tyneside resident	<p>I've just looked at the plan on your portal and spotted on page 8...the map, that all residential is shaded in red. apart from Quayside Court and Riverside Quays on Bell Street. Is there a good reason for this? If not it needs amending. its seems strange that our buildings are the only residential ones not highlighted. Quayside court is actually the oldest residential building on the Fishquay (that hasn't been converted) then I don't really see why they aren't shaded. And who decides on the areas to be shaded, seems very arbitrary. I also think it will be misleading to any developers looking at the map...ie if they think that there is no residential there then they may think that , the Bilton Building for example, would be suitable for a non-appropriate development such as a night club etc etc.</p>	<p>The idea behind the shadings on the maps is that it's not a description of what's there now, it's the Neighbourhood Plan Group's suggestions for the kinds of land uses they'd consider appropriate in the future. However, we will change your buildings to red to ensure clarity.</p>
North Tyneside resident	<p>Appears sensible</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
North Tyneside resident	<p>8.1.1 In the first sentence "Quay." typo. Also there is repetition of the same phrase</p>	<p>Amended.</p>

<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>8.2.2 Housing developments should be assessed in terms of planning policy. Financial viability should not feature in a planning decision and any decision made on that basis would be open to judicial review</p>	<p>Para. 173 of NPPF states "Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened." Sentence will be amended to be clear that viability is considered at planning policy stage rather than planning application stage.</p>
<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>8.2.4 The prominent location of this site means that that any development should be in keeping with the surrounding area and not dominate the Crescent green space, other buildings, close off views of the river etc and lose an opportunity for tourism by making the area unattractive. The development should have its own on-site parking for residents and their visitors. With regard to remediation, although the site is probably contaminated, I am not aware of any discharge of contamination from the site and if there is then it is the responsibility of the current owners to tackle the problem. The Environment Agency should be the enforcement body</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

North Tyneside resident	8.2.5 I agree with the comments in this section and refer to my comment on 8.2.4. To avoid over domination, the development should not have a high elevation right up the site boundary with Tanners Bank and Union Quay and also spoil the setting of the Low Lights Pub and the Irvin Building through inappropriate scale and massing	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	8.2.8 It is inappropriate to specify the number of units when the design has not been finalised (flats or houses? Single homes or family units? mixed use or totally residential?). Numbers, scale and massing need to be assessed as part of the planning application and it would be wrong for a developer to justify numbers on the basis of being consistent with this study and hence have the approval of the local community	As stated in 8.2.8 these numbers are from the AAP preferred options, and are merely indicative. The Group have chosen to support these indicative numbers.
North Tyneside resident	8.2.9 “..ways were found..” not “....ways where found..”	Amended.
North Tyneside resident	Would imagine that redevelopment of Tyne Brand site would be very expensive & maybe not viable in present economic climate	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	8.4.6 Starts with the phrase “these sites” and it is not clear until later what sites are being referred to. Suggest rewording	Amended.

North Tyneside resident	Greater variety of residential uses needs to be incorporated, with units relating to the area, not turning their backs on it as with the disastrous and isolationist developments between the Quay and the ferry terminal.	Noted. Design Guidelines of Chapter 4 aim to ensure all development relates to the area.
North Tyneside resident	8.2.6/Housing Objective B. I currently live in Renaissance Point and have a view from my rear bedroom window out and over the sea and across to Tynemouth. This view was one of the reasons why I bought my house, therefore would not support the building of houses on the Battery Factory site in Walker Place - which would affect my view.	Perceived loss of views is not a valid reason to object to the principle of housing on this site. The site already features a building. The SPD in chapter 4 advocates that new development should not exceed the height of what it replaces. If a proposal for new development came forward on this site, this point would be considered along with other planning policy, including those that protect the amenity of residents.
North Tyneside resident	I note that the document refers to mixed use development, that could include housing for Walker Place. I would be keen to know more about what the mixed development would include.	Any development would be dependent on a private developer coming forward with a scheme, this SPD just sets out a preference for possible land uses. The SPD in Housing Objective B sets out a preference at Walker Place for housing or B1 employment land use. The B1 use class includes offices, research, laboratories or light industry uses.
North Tyneside resident	As it goes and in keeping with the area	Noted.

<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>The desperate need for affordable housing for rent in the borough makes the proposal for housing on previous industrial sites attractive but only if the houses built are mostly social housing. And this needs to be balanced by the similarly desperate needs for jobs.</p>	<p>The increased supply of housing to the market will make provision generally more affordable. The Council have guidelines already in place for the provision of affordable housing, in Planning Advice Note 13.</p>
<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>There is little remaining of the industrial past of the area so the Rubber Company building should be preserved if at all possible. The construction of more riverside apartments should be discouraged... enough is enough!! The Waldo Street site is utterly unsuitable for housing and rather underlines and highlights the failings of this document. Considering the current housing market and the plans for Smith's Dock is this document simply a vehicle for land owners to increase the value of their sites? I suspect so. Why not designate the Tyne Brand site or the Rubber Company site for car parking? That is what's needed, NOT more unaffordable housing. Or maybe these areas could be open spaces or parks?? That is what local people REALLY want, but then the organisers of this plan didn't reach out to them, they were much happier sitting down with the landowners and those involved in the fishing industry.</p>	<p>Waldo Street no longer identified as a housing site. The Design Principles have been included to ensure good quality developments in the future. Local people were given several opportunities to get involved with the preparation of the SPD - see relevant section of the Cabinet report.</p>

	<p>The latest 'development' on the Lilley and Gilley site is a case in point... it is a gated development which physically turns it back on the area. It's going to be darned ugly and it's going to sit there for very many years. The people who live there will drive in and drive out and probably not spend a penny locally. It going to be higher than recommended in the Conservation documents, it affords no public access to the river and it removes a huge chunk of river view for the many to enjoy. Surely lessons can be learnt from this and the hideous Dolphin Quays development.</p>	
<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>The big question is... is there a need for new housing developments locally? The answer is no... Smith's Dock will provide quite enough.</p>	<p>As outlined in the Core Strategy Preferred Options, the Strategic Housing Market Availability Assessment and the Five Year Housing Land Supply study, the Borough requires an increase in housing units to meet future needs - more than what can be delivered through the Smiths Dock development alone.</p>
<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>The Smiths Dock development will change the area completely. More residential housing should be confined to Union Quay end of the North Shields Fish Quay. Nowhere in the document is there a consideration of Smiths Dock.</p>	<p>References to Smith's Dock have been added. As outlined in the Core Strategy Preferred Options, the Strategic Housing Market Availability Assessment and the Five Year Housing Land Supply study, the Borough requires an increase in housing units to meet future needs - more than what can be delivered through the Smiths Dock development alone.</p>

North
Tyneside
resident

Our proposal for Waldo St is that the council would consider an open space on the site of the derelict garages. Our suggestions are as follows...for a grassed area...the planting of trees which would ease toxic fume emissions...raised flower beds and park benches. The building of houses on this site would cause many problems i.e. parked cars which would double in volume if these houses were built. Also the access of public services to the street. We the residents feel that care and consideration is needed for the future of our street and the adjoining areas. This is not just about parking, access it is about developing the potential of a historical and cultured diverse area. The approach at the Fish Quay at Tanners Bank and Borough Road are the windows to an already busy popular area.

The Council would consider a proposal for an area of open space at this site should the land owner chose, and wouldn't necessarily consider it unfavourably. The Council cannot implement this proposal themselves because they do not own the site.

Tourists from the UK...Europe and World wide...can get a view of a busy river our "Tyne". Economically it is a gold mine...if you plan with the forethought needed. "Building houses" on the proposed areas may bring about short term economic prosperity. But it is about the long haul to coin a fishy term. By landscaping the area in "Waldo St" with a community garden. The areas around "Yeoman Street"...the bank top and "Tanners Bank" give a viewing platform, also from "St. Peter's Stairs"...for locals and vistors. If you craete a beautiful place that people want to come and visit they will, spend money...want to live here, but without a "FRAME" they will not see a picture.

Environment
Agency

There are no permitted waste sites currently located within the fish quay neighbourhood plan area. However, there are two operational waste sites located on Hudson Street, which is adjacent to the fish quay neighbourhood plan area. The two sites both undertake vehicle dismantling activities. The proposed housing development, located near to Hudson Street, is considered to be a sensitive land use, which is situated in close proximity to the two operational waste sites that undertake vehicle dismantling. The permit requires the operator to apply appropriate measures to prevent, or where that is not practicable, to minimise noise and vibration. However, there may still be potential for emissions of noise from the site at a level which may cause annoyance outside the site. The proposed development of residential properties will place people at closer proximity to the operational waste sites, potentially increasing the risk of exposure to noise from activities at the complex.

Noted.

The operator will need to assess the impact of its activities on the proposed development and potentially have to undertake increased mitigation to maintain its permit to operate in its current location to protect the occupiers of the proposed development from noise impacts, potentially at significant cost to the operator. If the operator can demonstrate that they have taken all reasonable action to mitigate these impacts, they would be satisfying the permit conditions and the manufacturing complex and community will co-exist, with some residual impacts. Only in very exceptional circumstances would we consider revoking the operators permit, for example, if there has been a non compliance with the permit.

Places for People representative	There is currently no reference to the outline planning approval for upto 815 residential properties located on the neighbouring Smiths Dock. These additional homes will, by there proximity add numerous benefits both social and financial to the Fish Quay.	Added at 2.8 "Change is occurring in the wider area too. Planning permission has recently been granted for approximately 800 homes, and some shops, restaurants and offices at Smith's Dock, which is immediately adjacent to the west of the FQNP area. The regeneration of this redundant area should bring about huge environmental improvements, the introduction of new access routes, and new residents and visitors to the area. We hope successful regeneration of Smith's Dock and Fish Quay can supplement each other to create a strong, vibrant area for residents and visitors alike."
----------------------------------	---	---

Chapter 9 Public Realm		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	I am entirely in agreement. 9.2.3.1 remove apostrophe from 'it's	Noted. Typo amended.

North Tyneside resident	The nicer the place becomes the more people will be attracted and enjoy and look after it. However like other countries we need to have visible cleaners all day ensuring that people are aware that we care about the area. We also need the Fish Quay to look very visible for those arriving by sea - coming down the Tyne is a great chance for people to say I would like to see that and it is only a few minutes away from where they dock.	Noted. Chapter 9 addresses the need for better cleaning and management from all FQ stakeholders. The FQ is considered "visible" - the four lighthouses for example are very visible.
North Tyneside resident	Tanners Bank does not inspire as a gateway. Greenspace management very poor	Chapters 9 and 10 address the issue here and put forward an objective to have this area covered by the Banksides Management Plan that will see its green space better maintained.
North Tyneside resident	Appears OK	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	9.2.2 It is stated that Tanners Bank needs to provide a "good impression." In addition to street maintenance, open views and the development of the Tyne Brand site are crucial in giving a positive first impression.	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	9.2.3.1 Suggest that licences for take-aways etc. should require them to collect litter every day within a certain distance of the facility. Also more and larger waste bins are required.	Public Realm Objective A asks for improvements to waste and rubbish storage, its control, management and collection. These suggestions are noted but too much detail for this document.

North Tyneside resident	9.2.3.3 See comment on 7.2.6 regarding advertising at the ferry port entrance	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	9.3 Objective C. See comment on 9.2.3.43	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	9.4.4 "Bankside steps." typo. Also at end of second sentence "...more would be welcome"	Banksides doesn't need a capital letter. Typo amended.
North Tyneside resident	A saving of £30,000 + could be made by using existing roads for a bus turning circle and pedestrian access to the fort area making the road one way and splitting it into half pedestrian and half traffic (1/3 to 2/3 split) past Bright Blue Studios direction away from the river as compared to the paid for URS suggested bus turning circle plan. Even more savings are possible by examining URS survey and proposals	Comments have been passed to Highways team, dealing with the URS Study.

North Tyneside resident	9.2.2 in considering Tanners Bank attention needs to be paid to the derelict land on the west side behind the new fish processing businesses. Who does it belong to? It could be an attractive woodland, but is ruined by rubbish close to the high iron railing and elsewhere. It needs a management plan and regular rubbish removal. The buildings lower down on the other side have been eyesores, but some are showing some improvement. This gateway is very important -don't interfere with the businesses, they add interest, but get it all cleaned up, both public and private realm.	The SPD calls for this area to be included in the Council's Banksides Management Plan in order for it to be effectively maintained.
North Tyneside resident	9.2.3.5 Urban Art should be promoted as an attraction for residents and visitors. Local people, including local school children might be drawn in to cherishing the FQ if they could play a part in designing or producing contributions.	Noted. Appropriate art work may be supported.
North Tyneside resident	The area can't cope with current visitor numbers, this document seeks to attract more. As stated previously, remove the fishing industry and fish and there's a chance to bring the area round.	The SPD calls upon the Council to seek better parking and access arrangements in the area. A Study has recently been drawn up by URS with potential solutions for these issues.
North Tyneside resident	As for bankside management, sadly there is no mention of greater public access or landscaping. The Clive Street bank could be transformed into a public garden with meandering paths through decorative	Creating gardens within the steep bankside does not seem feasible. The SPD does propose the former Crescent site be kept as open space available for public access and use.

	planting. How good would that look to passing ships?	
North Tyneside resident	Management of increasing numbers of visitors is a real problem. It has to be sorted out before building things to attract them.	The SPD calls upon the Council to seek better parking and access arrangements in the area. A Study has recently been drawn up by URS with potential solutions for these issues.
Places for People representative	Agree fully with this section. At times the area can look untidy due to the existing waste management facilities. Urban Art can certainly add vibrancy and interest to an area but if left unattended it can become scruffy and give the wrong impression of an area.	Noted.

Chapter 10 Biodiversity and Open Spaces		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	I am entirely in agreement. 10.4.1 "The above objections" - should this be objectives?	Noted. Typo amended.
North Tyneside resident	As much nature to be kept as is possible.	The SPD encourages more land to be classified as open space than is currently the case in existing planning documents.

North Tyneside resident	The Crescent greenspace is surrounded by parked cars thus detracting from its amenity. Trees along the banks are pretty but difficult to maintain	Transport and Accessibility Objective C supports the better utilisation of car parks rather than on-street parking. The issues with the banksides are recognised, and the SPD supports the aims of the Banksides Management Plan that sets out their continued maintenance.
North Tyneside resident	Appears OK	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	10.1.2 "Bankside"	Banksides doesn't need a capital letter.
North Tyneside resident	10.4.2 Last word should be "conservation" not "conversation."	Amended.
North Tyneside resident	See comment on page 8 as regards the open or incorporated development around the Crescent area	The document supports the use of the Crescent site for events and activities that will link in with the wider tourism/leisure draw (see Tourism and Leisure Objective A).
North Tyneside resident	North Tyneside seems to have a rooted objection to tree planting on a scale necessary to make a difference. The 'landscaping' of the banks opposite the old Lilley and Gilley offices can only be described as pathetic.	Opinions on NTC's approach to tree planting are not appropriate to this document. The treatment of the banksides is outlined in the Banksides Management Plan that was compiled with the input of the Fish Quay Heritage Partnership and was adopted by Council Cabinet.

North Tyneside resident	Narrow but do not remove the Highlights bankside biodiversity tree link to enable river views and keep green corridor link N. side of Tyne Brand Site /bottom of Prospect Terrace.	Area south of Prospect Terrace may form part of Tyne Brand redevelopment site. Leaving it as “mixed use” does not preclude the area remaining as green land.
North Tyneside resident	You could add in that greenery cleans the air and absorbs carbon, improves ones sense of well-being and encourages residents, particularly perhaps older people who may tend to stay in doors, to get out of the house. There is evidence too that a view of trees and flowers speeds recovery in the sick.	Words to this affect added at 10.1.2
North Tyneside resident	I do not understand this section in the document. It refers to this, that and something else and is written in committeese. A list of wildlife species and habitats would have been useful here. Again, another example of the fundamantal flaws of this document. It seeks to confuse and obscurate, not to illuminate and inform.	The Banksides Management Plan and the Biodiversity Action Plan (both referred to in the SPD) outline the species and habitats of the area. There is no need to repeat them here.
North Tyneside resident	The steep banks along the river could be a great corridor for wildlife. More attention to the nature of planting should be given. Insect friendly planting would be one idea. Perennials with no maintenance.	These areas are a wildlife corridor. The treatment of the banksides is outlined in the Banksides Management Plan that was compiled with the input of the Fish Quay Heritage Partnership and was adopted by Council Cabinet. The document seeks to maintain the balance between protecting wildlife and views of the area.

Places for People representative	As stated, areas of open space should be retained. Consideration should be made to improving appearance as some areas can look unattractive especially with unwanted general waste.	noted.
Natural England Representative	Furthermore developments likely to affect the Northumbria Coast SPA and Ramsar site will, in accordance with the Habitats Directives require a Habitat Regulation Assessment. This should be made clear in the Neighbourhood Plan.	“Furthermore developments likely to affect the Northumbria Coast SPA and Ramsar site will, in accordance with the Habitats Directives require a Habitat Regulation Assessment.” Added at 10.1.1.
Natural England Representative	Protection and enhancement of wildlife sites and an increase in the plan area’s biodiversity must be an objective within the Ecological Chapter.	New Biodiversity and Open Spaces Objective C added: “That appropriate management and maintenance of the area’s biodiversity is pursued to allow for its protection and enhancement.”

General Comments		
Consultee	Comment	Our response
North Tyneside resident	I commend the dedication of the team, knowing how much time and effort has been spent on preparing the document.	Noted. Thank you.

North Tyneside resident	I think the document is good and hope that comments are taken on board in order to make the Fish Quay a place to enjoy and not to dread. Perhaps one of these should have been done for The Spanish City!!!! or did I miss that??	Noted. The Fish Quay is the only neighbourhood plan area in the Borough. The Spanish City is included within the Coastal Area Action Plan.
North Tyneside resident	It's a good start but economic constraints will make many of the aims long term I fear	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	Fully support the vision & objectives	Noted.
North Tyneside resident	Good document that would be improved by some financial estimates (approximate sums)	Whilst the economic viability of its suggestions have been considered, planning documents of this nature do not usually contain financial sums.
North Tyneside resident	An abridged version of the document would be much appreciated	The document contains an Executive Summary that provides a suitable overview.
North Tyneside resident	My overall impression is that the group must be congratulated on what they have produced in what at times must have seemed something of a thankless task. I for one would like to express my appreciation of their efforts. Although I have a number of comments to make I do not wish to be thought of as being negative with regard to their achievement.	Noted. Thank you.

North Tyneside resident	The document contains many acronyms, for example FISHCAST, EDAW, AAP, NPPF etc. It would help for these to be listed, given their full names and details provided of their terms of reference. At least give their full names, with the acronym used bracketed the first time it is mentioned.	FISHcast and EDAW are the names of the organisations who wrote the documents referred to, so they can't be expanded. All other acronyms are given their full names the first time they're used - see chapter 2.
North Tyneside resident	The Fish Quay area has a number of sensitive sites and I believe that their development should have an underlying principle that any development's impact should be beneficial, opening up or maintaining views to the river and Cliffords Fort from the main access routes and that it should not have a negative impact on the surrounding area. One particular concern where I have an obvious interest is the Tyne Brand Site and the open area on the site of the former Crescent Buildings. I believe any development on the Tyne Brand site should not, by virtue of its scale or massing, have an overbearing impact on this open area or have a detrimental impact on surrounding buildings, some of which have had substantial public investment in their renovation. There could also be a significant impact on the quality of life of current residents and also local tourism based enterprises if issues such as parking are not addressed as part of the	noted.

	development	
North Tyneside resident	In the text (8.2.8), the potential number of residential units on several development sites is given. I believe it inappropriate at this stage to indicate the acceptable number of units when the design has not been finalised (flats or houses? Single homes or family units? mixed use or totally residential?). Numbers and the consequential scale and massing issues need to be assessed as part of the planning application and it would be wrong for a developer to justify numbers on the basis of being consistent with this study and hence have the tacit approval of the local community	As stated in 8.2.8 these numbers are from the AAP preferred options, and are merely indicative. Indicative numbers have to be worked out so that we are able to ascertain how we could deliver our housing needs in the borough. The Neighbourhood Plan Group were happy to support these indicative numbers in their document.
North Tyneside resident	The business viability of any development is raised in several clauses. I believe this subject should be outside the scope of this document and should not be included. Financial viability should not be used as evidence of community approval for any project	Viability does need to be considered in plan-making, as advised in paras 173 and 174 of NPPF. There have been some amendments made that clarify that this consideration comes at the plan-making stage, not the planning application stage.

North Tyneside resident	On a number of occasions it is stated that developments should be judged on a case by case basis. Although this applies to specific planning applications, any development must harmonise with the area, be consistent with planning strategy (which I hope will be influenced by this document) and have due regard to precedent	References have been amended.
North Tyneside resident	It covers a very wide wish list, and presented clearly. GOOD LUCK	Noted, thank you.
North Tyneside resident	In general it is to be warmly welcomed.	Noted, thank you.
North Tyneside resident	Can anything be done about the third world hygiene standards carried out by the company opposite the (new) Low Lighthouse.	This isn't the remit of this SPD - will pass on concerns to Environmental Health.
North Tyneside resident	The Supplementary Planning Document has the potential to benefit everyone who uses the area. Many local people have put a great deal of thought and time into the work and their efforts should be recognised.	Noted. Thank you.

North Tyneside resident	<p>I am concerned that there is the depressing potential for site owners and developers to ignore or manipulate the content of this Supplementary Planning Document for their own gain at the expense of the community. Any owner or developer should only be granted planning consent if the project provides a positive contribution to the area. So often, owners and developers believe that because they own the land and have money then it gives them the power to dominate and bully to achieve their ends. In the case of the Tyne Brand Site, it has been suggested that the site will remain derelict unless developer's demands are satisfied. In my opinion it is better that nothing is done rather than something that damages the atmosphere and potential of the area. I already hear people say that "anything is better than nothing". This is a mistake. Everyone can benefit from sensitive and thoughtful consideration of the plans. No one should accept anything that is a defeatist compromise.</p>	<p>The document includes a chapter on Design Principles that is aimed to ensure any development that takes place is executed to the best standards.</p>
-------------------------------	---	---

North Tyneside resident	I left the drop-in session with the firm impression from both the chairman and yourself that the primary importance was to produce a document acceptable to North Tyneside Council and that its content and community input should be modified to this end.	As a Supplementary Planning Document, it has to be the case that this document follows from existing planning documents, and it has to be the case that it is supported by a solid planning policy background and evidence base. This is set out in part 4, paragraph 8 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. We would therefore suggest that the document has to be acceptable to the planning regulations, rather than to the Council.
North Tyneside resident	I am also concerned that there is an attitude that it is better to do something with the development sites than to leave them derelict. I do not believe that an implied threat such as this should be considered. Owners and developers have already invested resources and money into these sites and to them “do nothing” is not an option. As such there is a negotiation to be had and a compromise to be made to hopefully produce developments in which the community can take pride and reap benefits.	The document includes a chapter on Design Principles that is aimed to ensure any development that takes place is executed to the best standards.
The Coal Authority	Having reviewed the document The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make.	Noted, thank you.

North Tyneside resident	There is a lot to read and take in and this is much too much for the average person to complete and though I have been quite critical I do appreciate how much unpaid time and effort has gone into this and preceding projects. I do not think the general public realise " the commitment required ", so I can only congratulate all those who have given " free time and effort " , especially the ones who do not stand to make personal gains therefrom.	noted.
North Tyneside resident	would really like to know how many submitted replies and to what degree the questions were answered I. e. has the project proved worthwhile?	All comments made and Group response will be included in the publically-available Cabinet Report.
Marine Management Organisation	The MMO is responsible for issuing marine licences under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. A marine licence may be needed for activities involving a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence. Any works may also require consideration under The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007 (as amended) and early consultation with the MMO is advised. In addition to the Marine Licensing requirements it will also be necessary for any development to comply with relevant European legislation.	Noted.

Marine Management Organisation	We would encourage engagement with the local fishing industry, including merchants, if this has not already been done. The fishing industry can work unsociable hours and at times be noisy and we would suggest consideration be given to this in relation proposed residential housing.	Fish Quay Company has been involved in the process.
North Tyneside resident	No greater contribution to the prosperity, look and attraction of the Fish Quay area, can be made then the removal of any of the dereliction now seen. The Tyne Brand site for the main example.	Agreed. The SPD reflects that this is a key aim for the area and hopes that by setting clear guidelines for the redevelopment of these sites, we will see their redevelopment soon.
Trustees of The Net	The Trustees of The Net agree that the Neighbourhood Plan is a very worthwhile document. The scope is commended; it is a comprehensive reference for all aspects of current activity and future development on the Fish Quay.	Noted, thank you.
North Tyneside resident	A difficult task, skillfully done. I suggest that greater emphasis on of what, in informed opinion, is increasingly recognised as the most serious threat to a better life of NT people, as well as the rest of the world -ie global warming and climate change- would make it more future-proof.	References to sustainable development are included throughout the document.

<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>It is extremely difficult reading and very hard to understand. Considering that it is a NEIGHBOURHOOD plan it has sadly failed to engage either the wider community or the neighbourhood as a whole. It is poorly written and uses language and a writing style which is at best cryptographic, seeking to avoid comment and engagement from the wider populus. If that was the steering groups plan... they have succeeded.</p>	<p>There have been no plans to exclude.</p>
<p>North Tyneside resident</p>	<p>It is lacking in any real detail as regards plans and seems to me to be taking the North Shields Fish Quay away from North Shields. If you want to consider history then remember that this was North Shields. It is in danger of becoming The Fish Quay. Is it true that the residents want a Tynemouth postcode?</p>	<p>We do not understand how this document can take away the geographical location of the Fish Quay.</p>

Environment
Agency

Parts of the Neighbourhood Plan area are located within flood zone 3 and as such are at a high risk of tidal flooding. The 'development essential to the fishing industry' is predominantly located in flood zone 3. Any redevelopment within this area should take into account the flood risk and potential sea level increases as a result of climate change in order to reduce the impacts and ensure the area is safe for users. It is important to note that the majority of the proposed housing areas are situated outside of flood zones 2 and 3. Although, some of the proposed housing areas in the southern section of the plan area are located in flood zone 3. We support the requirements that these housing areas will need to provide adequate mitigation against flooding through site specific Flood Risk Assessments. Some of the mixed use areas, which are proposed as part of the draft neighbourhood plan, are sited in flood zone 3. Mixed use development within these areas should be designed to be safe from flooding and reduce the impact of a flood.

Noted. Further information included at 10.2.4.

We support mitigating the level of flood risk in the area through the layout and form of development and appropriate application of sustainable drainage techniques as stated in Section 10.2.4 of the draft neighbourhood plan. Prior to considering flood risk mitigation measures, we would recommend a Sequential Test and Exception Test (if required) be undertaken to support any planning application sites located in flood zones 2 and 3. The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Information in relation to the Sequential Test is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. This is a national planning policy requirement for all but minor development, extensions, and change of use applications proposed in areas of flood risk.

Environment
Agency

The draft neighbourhood plan proposes development adjacent to the riverside including housing, mixed use, development essential to the fishing industry and leisure and tourism. We recognise the importance of regenerating this area because of potential economic benefits, support to the local fishing industry and creation of a more sustainable environment. Any proposed development within the neighbourhood plan area should take into account migrating salmonids, which may be affected by vibrations from any piling works. River and Sea Lamprey migrate through this area and can be sensitive to small changes in flow, oxygen content and water quality, especially from de-silting and heavy metals. River Lamprey migrate between October and March whereas Sea Lamprey migrate between May and June. Any works that take place on silts will need to take account of European eel, as they also pass through this area.

Paragraph added at 10.2.6 to highlight sensitivity of area.

	<p>It is recommended that development should not extend any further into the river channel. In the past vertical concrete and sheet piled walls have confined the river and this has had the effect of constricting the channel width and reducing the amount of water the channel can safely carry. In addition, encroachment has led to the loss of areas of tidal foreshore, which are extremely valuable feeding and resting places for the rivers' fish, birds and invertebrates. On this basis, we would welcome early discussions regarding any proposed development in these areas.</p>	
Places for People representative	<p>Overall this is a positive document for the Fish Quay and I generally welcome its content. It does however fall short in addressing how the Fish Quay will work in conjunction with its neighbour's ambitions (Royal Quay, Town Centre, Smiths Dock). I appreciate there are supporting documents but to anyone looking at this document in isolation it is relatively quiet on the 'bigger' picture.</p>	<p>Paragraph now added at 2.7 to address Smiths Dock. References throughout the SPD on links to other areas.</p>
English Heritage representative	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for North Shields Fish Quay. It provides a clear explanation of the key issues, and proposals for addressing</p>	<p>Noted, thank you.</p>

	<p>them, backed up by evidence. I welcome the ‘heritage thread’ that runs throughout the document, recognising the contribution that heritage plays to the vitality of the area, in particular Clifford’s Fort.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the Tyne Brand site will be key in creating a critical mass of activity and development in the area. This would be a key site within the setting of Clifford’s Fort, offering exciting opportunities for new development in the area. I welcome the adoption of Design Know-How and the Conservation Area Management Strategies to inform and guide the development proposals both here and on other redevelopment sites. Congratulations to the team for preparing one of the first Neighbourhood Plans. It is a clear, well set out document which expresses the group’s and community’s vision for the area. We look forward to working together on the implementation of the plan’s vision.</p>	
<p>Natural England Representative</p>	<p>Paragraph 10.1.1 within the Neighbourhood Plan recognises the existence of the Northumberland Coast Shore Site of Special Scientific Interest within the easternmost part of the plan area and Northumbria Coast Special Protection Area and Ramsar site approximately 300m from the plan’s boundary. Whilst this is welcomed, the</p>	<p>As set out in paragraph 10.1.1, policies that protect these designated areas are within the UDP.</p>

	Neighbourhood Plan should further embed protection and enhancement of the natural environment throughout the Neighbourhood Plan.	
--	--	--