

Report to Council

Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft,
20 October 2015

Appendix 1: Schedule of
Representations Received to the
Local Plan Consultation Draft
Policies (2015) and Officer
Responses

Schedule of Representations Received

This schedule provides a complete account of all representations providing a written comment to a policy or proposal received during consultation on the Local Plan Consultation Draft February 2015. The representations are from residents, landowners and other stakeholders with an interest or role in plan making.

North Tyneside Council have reviewed and prepared a response to all these responses as part of the preparation of the next stage of the Local Plan.

How to use this document as a respondent

This document is saved in Adobe PDF format and you can use the “Find” function to navigate to particular Comments you are interested in. You can access find by the keyboard shortcut “Ctrl F”, within the “Edit” menu on Adobe Reader, or via a toolbar link at the top of your page.

- Policies - the representations are arranged in order of the policy of the Local Plan Consultation Draft 2015 they have been identified as relevant to. For example, Policy S7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites.
- Person IDs – If you are a previous respondent that made a specific comment directly in relation to a site within the Local Plan Consultation Draft 2015, you will have a Person ID. You can type this ID into “Find” within the document to locate each site where your ID and comment has been recorded and summarised.

If you would like any assistance accessing this information or finding specific information within this schedule of representations, you can contact the Planning Policy Team at:

planning.policy@northtyneside.uk

Tel: 0191 643 2310.

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| 586329 | | RESIDENT | LP20151 | It is pleasing to see that residents' comments have been listened to (unlike in the previous Core Strategy). What a shame this plan was not put forward five years ago. | | Introduction 1 | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 878568 | | | LP20152 | 1.20 There are 2 routes by car from the coast to Newcastle - The new coast road (A1058) and the old coast road (A186/A191). The more housing you 'stuff' into the remaining space at the coast, the more congested these routes will become. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The suggested growth in the Local Plan has been used in the transport modelling work that has informed the junction improvements in the Borough with the purpose to make it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 878651 | | RESIDENT | LP20155 | Concern that West Moor is not labelled on the Summary Map. | | Introduction 1 | The Summary Map is a simple overview of the Borough and the Local Plan proposals. It was not possible to include comprehensive information and so not every area is labelled. We apologise if this has caused concern but would stress that there is no significance in the omission of a specific label for this or any other area. We will consider these concerns in future map preparation. | Reference to West Moor will be included in future mapping |
| 878568 | | | LP201512 | 1.20 I wouldn't describe Newcastle as easily accessible by road at peak commuter times. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 878568 | | | LP201513 | 1.39 What about the effects on wildlife in areas that are not European designated wildlife sites. At the back of Thorntree Drive there are hedgerows and trees that have always supported birds and animals. There are mice, voles, stoats, foxes, bats, hedgehogs | | Introduction 1 | Para 1.39 (now para 1.30) discusses the Local Plan's Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA). HRAs are prepared under the European Union Habitats Directive to provide an assessment of the affect of a plan or project on sites considered to be of | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | and a huge variety of birds that come to roost including the ones that rely on them, like the sparrowhawks. | | | European importance for their nature conservation value. Sites that are not of European importance are considered and have policies for their protection in chapter 8 <i>The Natural Environment</i> of the Local Plan. | |
| 804904 | | | LP201528 | I'll look forward to reviewing and providing a more thorough review of the plans although initial thoughts are that my previous comments have been almost completely ignored for the greater good of developing so called greenfield sites that in NT area doesn't seem to mean a thing as long as they are not in the councillors back yard! Disappointing but as to be expected by such a small minded electorate. I'll look forward to printing off all 174 pages and reviewing only to tell me that the choice of sites is completely inevitable and the habitat of wildlife will be perfectly capable of emigrating to more suitable brown belt land / more built up areas in the perceived view that there extinction in the area will benefit the overall aged human population by reducing the amount of poverty in the area! To coin one of my favourite films... you are here because you were sent here, you were told to come here and you obeyed. [Laughs] It is, of course, the way of all things. You see, there is only one constant, one universal, it is the only real truth: causality. Action. Reaction. Cause and effect. Morpheus: Everything begins with choice. Merovingian: No. Wrong. Choice is an illusion, created between those with power, and those without. Look there, at that woman. My God, just look at her. Affecting everyone around her, so obvious, so bourgeois, so boring. But | | Introduction 1 | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | wait... Watch - you see, I have sent her dessert, a very special dessert. I wrote it myself. It starts so simply, each line of the program creating a new effect, just like poetry. First, a rush... heat... her heart flutters. You can see it, Neo, yes? She does not understand why - is it the wine? No. What is it then, what is the reason? And soon it does not matter, soon the why and the reason are gone, and all that matters is the feeling itself. This is the nature of the universe. We struggle against it, we fight to deny it, but it is of course pretence, it is a lie. Beneath our poised appearance, the truth is we are completely out of control. Causality. There is no escape from it, we are forever slaves to it. Our only hope, our only peace is to understand it, to understand the `why.' `Why' is what separates us from them, you from me. `Why' is the only real social power, without it you are powerless. And this is how you come to me, without `why,' without power. Another link in the chain. But fear not, since I have seen how good you are at following orders, I will tell you what to do next. Run back, and give the fortune teller this message: Her time is almost up. Now I have some real business to do, I will say adieu and goodbye. | | | | |
| 879296 | | RESIDENT | LP201533 | Do not destroy aspects of North Tyneside that currently attract people unless significant improvements are planned to road and transport networks in advance of proposed developments. These proposals seem short-sighted for short term Council financial gain. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 879463 | | RESIDENT | LP201542 | * do you want to know my sex when I was born or my current status * my age varies | | Introduction 1 | As stated alongside these questions, they are used for equality monitoring purposes | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | depending on whether my grandson is with me * the colour of my skin varies with the factor of my sun cream * I vary my sexuality depending on my mood * I keep my health problems between me and my doctor You may take it as read that I find these questionnaires a complete and utter waste of time. | | | to help the Council to understand who they are reaching with their consultations and how they may better consult in the future. As stated, they are optional and do not need to be completed. | |
| 891715 | | | LP2015201 | You missed out one legged squint eyed lesbian in your Equality Monitoring list. What does that have to do with building houses for Heavens sake!!! Apart from that bit of stupidity, by the time this lot is built, the only bit of green left will be on our back lawns. Far too much housing in Whitley Bay and far too much fees added as well at the coast for Council run Services. Try inland for a change. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The monitoring questions help provide a record of those people who respond to the consultation so that we can measure which groups in society are and are not engaging with the Local Plan and whether we need to address this in subsequent consultations. The questions are not mandatory. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections over the next 15 years places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 467684 | | RESIDENT | LP2015322 | I believe this consultation is a sham and a waste of time and money. Hoping the councillors enjoy their pay rise by the way! | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. North Tyneside Council are required by planning legislation to carry out public consultation events. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015462 | Thank you for e-mail of 11 February 2015 consulting South Tyneside Council on the revised consultation version of North Tyneside€™s emerging Local Plan development plan document. As part of the North East LA7 group of local authorities€™ we are committed to working closely with North Tyneside Council in contributing to the | | Introduction 1 | Support noted for continued commitment to work closely together and as part of the LA7group in accordance with the Duty to cooperate requirements. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | preparation of your development plan in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate requirements and the LA7 Memorandum of Understanding. This response is further to our response to the previous version in December 2013 and participation in the North Tyneside Local Plan workshop event in October 2014. We note the duty to co-operate and regional context, and the ongoing dialogue between the LA7 group of authorities on key cross-boundary issues, as recognised in the introductory section to the Local Plan, together with the North East Local Enterprise Partnership and Combined Authority and the Strategic Economic Plan. | | | | |
| 801358 | | RESIDENT | LP2015484 | I feel this is yet another case of NTC paying lip service to the tax paying residents of this borough because, regardless of what we think or say, we will be wholeheartedly ignored. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Council are actively seeking to engage with the public in the production of the forthcoming Local Plan and it has already been through many stages of public consultation. The Council reviews each comment submitted and considers how it can influence the Local Plan as it is progressed. The views of residents have to be balanced against other factors such as national government policy and population projections. The views of residents are not ignored. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. The reality of recent planning appeals for large scale housing development within the Borough, which have been refused by the Council but overturned at appeal by a independent inspector, reflects the position of the Council having to make provision for future generations. | |
| | | | LP2015488 | It is obviously a very large document for people to get their heads around and given this plan will effect how planning decisions are made for some time local contribution is difficult. How the local authority apply these with their own applications is a concern - especially in light of the current application for demolition of Central Lower Prom!! (which I object to by the way). Also of concern is that this event has not been well advertised in Whitley Bay. There are very few people here. | | Introduction 1 | Comments noted. The Local Planning Authority act impartially in the assessment of all applications and any decision made is able to be fully scrutinised. Drop-in events were advertised in a number of ways, including via a leaflet delivered to every property in the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898311 | | RESIDENT | LP2015743 | Broadly I am in agreement with the 2015 | | Introduction 1 | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 791875 | | RESIDENT | LP2015851 | The plans all look comprehensive and I ask who is paying for all of these investigations now, and if improved, the actual constructions of the changes? Could the forthcoming election alter the arrangements? | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Plan has been through many previous stages of public consultation where the proposals have been amended and refined (this information is available to view on the Council website). Studies on the evidence required to bring forward the Local Plan have been carried out by a number of different parties, some internal to the Council and some who have been commissioned by the Council. Some funding has been received from government | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | agencies to help support the evidence of the Local Plan. Since the election there has been no change in the commitment to deliver an up to date Local Plan for North Tyneside. | |
| 898964 | | | LP2015992 | 1. I think the rigmarole of having to register to make comments will considerably reduce the number of comments received by the council. | | Introduction 1 | We are sorry that you found our consultation portal difficult to use to make your comments on the Local Plan. We understand that people may want to use different methods to make their comments and thus welcomed comments via the portal, email, letter or the feedback slip that was delivered to every property in the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898404 | | RESIDENT | LP2015993 | I am appalled by the plans to build all these new houses in the Benton area. This area has seen a dramatic rise in residential housing, with the developments at Darsley Green and East Benton Rise. My complaints centre around, pollution, loss of identity for the area, strain on public services, loss of wildlife, the legacy we are leaving our children and grandchildren and above all congestion. Have any of these Councillors or planners drove along Whitley Road in a rush hour? I hope the council planners don't hide behind the "it's the Government's fault" line, as I will be making a freedom of information request after this has been decided to check on the veracity of these claims. I naively thought we lived in a democracy! | | Introduction 1 | The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside places a requirement on the authority to plan for growth due to the guidance from national government guidance (NPPF). Without an up to date Local Plan future development within the Borough will happen on an ad hoc basis and the reality of recent planning appeals at places such as Scaffold Hill near Holystone, Whitehouse Farm, near West Moor and Station Road at Wallsend have all reinforced the need for the Council to bring forward additional sites to meet the levels of growth being forecast. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>Policy DM8.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' (now DM5.2) and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. A number of constraints lie within the proposed development sites, whether its wildlife corridors or flood zones which will result in smaller site areas for some sites. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of infrastructure to support the levels of growth proposed in the Local Plan is reflected in the relevant Section and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements (including along the A191) to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough.</p> | |
| 898968 | Killingworth Village Residents' Association | | LP2015994 | On behalf of Killingworth Village residents we wish to submit the following: Firstly, we understand that there has to be a master plan so that central government targets are met. However, we feel that the building on | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. It is important that the needs of the existing and future residents are considered within the two large areas of development at Murton and Killingworth Moor. the strategic allocations policy | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>Killingworth Moor does not provide nearly enough protection for Killingworth Village conservation area. Our main concerns are the road infrastructure, in particular the links onto the B1317 which is basically a country road originally designed for horses and carts. This road is completely unsuitable for the increased volume of traffic. The junction at Palmersville, complete with traffic lights is already in existence and the size of the roads proposed gives the impression that Development had already been decided. The lack of amenities and strain put on existing amenities would be a real cause for concern. Schools, doctors and the lack of public transport in this area remain an area for concern since there are no real plans outlined. It is our opinion that local people should have at least equal input into the future Development as any developers. We feel that a master plan should not be written by the developers and any proposals for the site should be resisted until a master plan is agreed.</p> | | | <p>outlines that further comprehensive master planning will be required by the landowner/s and North Tyneside Council to ensure the provision of essential infrastructure, facilities and services are appropriately provided. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of health and education facilities is reflected in the Infrastructure section of the Plan The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers and NHS England to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary and secondary school to meet the needs of the future populations at Killingworth Moor and Murton, plus additional health facilities. The transport infrastructure to support the development of each site and the connections to the wider transport will be developed as the Masterplan is prepared for each site.</p> | |
| 805282 | | | LP20151002 | <p>This plan appears to be 'preferred' by the developers who should not be allowed a biased say in the local area of the people who actually live here and their pay council tax! It is written to confuse the majority and should be laid out in a clear and concise manner for people to understand. It appears to me that my views from the original consultation have been largely ignored by people who have a vested interest in this plan going ahead. I strongly disagree with the development of the Annitsford Farm site as it will over develop an</p> | | Introduction 1 | <p>The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside places a requirement on the authority to plan for growth due to the guidance from national government guidance (NPPF). Without an up to date Local Plan future development within the Borough will happen on an ad hoc basis and the reality of recent planning appeals at places such as Scaffold Hill near Holystone, Whitehouse Farm, near West Moor and</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | already busy area and lose valuable green space and homes for wildlife. | | | Station Road at Wallsend have all reinforced the need for the Council to bring forward additional sites to meet the levels of growth being forecast. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM8.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' (now DM5.2) and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. A number of constraints lie within the proposed development sites, whether its wildlife corridors or flood zones which will result in smaller site areas for some sites. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of infrastructure to support the levels of growth proposed in the Local Plan is reflected in the relevant section and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements (including along the A191) to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | |
| 898977 | | | LP20151004 | Brownfield sites should be considered for any form of development prior to consideration of developing greenfield sites. As you are no doubt aware the NPPF (March 2012) suggests that:"encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value". (Section 17 NPPF) 111. Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land. Submitted by Alan Vasey | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. The Councils intention to prioritise delivery of housing on brown field land is reflected in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1), but when allocating sites for new development there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898964 | | | LP20151069 | I would like more explanation of how this plan dovetails with neighbouring councils' plans. How can we be assured that the level of house building proposed is not going to encourage people to move into the area, and have little impact on demand? | | Introduction 1 | This Local Plan has been prepared alongside an ongoing process of engagement with neighbouring authorities as part of the duty to co-operate. Through that process Newcastle and Northumberland, as our two closest neighbours have prepared their own plans that each include measures to increase the overall rate of housing delivery and retain a greater proportion of their working age population. Those plans have the potential to influence rates of migration between the authorities. The overall proposals for North Tyneside reflect a lower | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | number of homes than would be required if people continued to live in North Tyneside and work in Newcastle at the same proportion that they do today and is informed by the aging of existing residents in the borough and jobs growth. | |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151071 | The Green Party is concerned about the future and the condition of our local communities which we will be passing on to our children and grandchildren in the context of the planet as a whole. We subscribe to the notion of sustainable development as a framework within which to assess proposed changes to the local environment. Sustainable development has 3 dimensions, all of which have equal value: social, environmental and economic. Economic and social growth have to be balanced against the impact on the environment. There are two other key considerations: the impact of climate change and the finite resources of the planet on which we live and depend upon for our food and wellbeing. Where climate change is concerned increasing instability of weather conditions worldwide is already having an impact upon food production and hence food prices here. We have seen increasing frequency of floods, droughts and strong winds all of which have a detrimental effect on our natural and built environment. The government's Environmental Audit Committee has recently (March 2015) warned on the climate change adaptation challenge. Despite the Government's National Adaptation Programme (NAP) putting the UK ahead of many countries in preparing for the | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The NPPF advises that Local Planning Authorities need to make decisions in accordance with achieving sustainable development and sets out the approaches they should take in doing so. Policy DM2.1 (now DM1.3) reflects this intention 'The Council will work pro-actively with applicants to jointly find solutions that mean proposals can be approved wherever possible that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area through the Development Management process and application of the policies of the Local Plan.'. The First Objective of the Local Plan is to promote the renewable energy sector and developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption, whilst improving the Borough's resilience to the effects of climate change, this is reflected throughout the policies of the Plan The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth and therefore Low Growth Option was not a suggested option at the last stage of consultation. The Councils intention to prioritise delivery of housing on | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>impacts of climate change, the Environmental Audit Committee has warned that it has not identified proactive adaptation policies and there is no sense that we are tackling the priority climate risks. There is nothing in this Local Plan which indicates that North Tyneside Council is taking climate change seriously. And as Naomi Klein warns: "We know that if we continue on our current path of allowing emissions to rise year after year climate change will change everything about our world. And we don't have to do anything to bring about this future. All we have to do is nothing."(This Changes Everything quoted in the Guardian 7th March 2015). This Local Plan must make provision for the actions that must take place in this borough to reduce carbon emissions and protect its residents as far as possible from the consequences of climate change. Where the finite resources of the planet is concerned, the assumption of perpetual economic growth is unsustainable (and leads, together with climate change, to competition for resources, war, and large scale migration of people which we are already seeing). This doesn't mean that no economic development is possible but it does mean that such development has to recycle as much as possible as well as contribute to the reduction in carbon emissions therefore promote recycled and recyclable goods, goods and services which promote energy efficiency and prioritise goods which have long lives as opposed to those which need frequent replacement. The implications of these concerns for the Local Plan are: Economic</p> | | | <p>brown field land is reflected in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1), but when allocating sites for new development there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM8.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' (now DM5.2) and wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now S5.1, DM5.2, DM5.4 and DM5.5) with the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. The approach of the Local Plan is to set the policy framework that can be applied to proposals. Where there are overlapping interests on a site these issues will need to be discussed on a site by site basis applying the relevant policies that are applicable. Each Policy has been reviewed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan which sets out the environmental, social and economic implications of the suggested policy contained in the Plan. This is to ensure that the preferred policy options are the most sustainable relative to other alternative options that could have been pursued. The Sustainability Appraisal can be viewed on the Council website. Within the two large areas of development at Murton and Killingworth Moor Policy AS7.4 (now S4.4)</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>growth has to be balanced against environmental and social considerations in particular reduction in carbon emissions and the impact of climate change. Opportunities for food production and therefore land use - should be included in plans for economic growth, Opportunities for waste reduction and waste recycling into products maximized Opportunities for energy production maximized including both generation and preservation/insulation The borough of North Tyneside has great potential for the creation of a more sustainable society for both present and future residents. The Local Plan should be a vehicle through which this can be achieved. In order to do this however the Local Plan needs to be amended in a number of key areas: Lower Growth Option for population and therefore economic and housing growth Specific attention given to sustainability in terms of energy generation, food production, clean air and water and other essentials to the wellbeing of residents. Giving the Local Authority's responsibility to maintain and enhance the natural environment equal weight to that of economic and housing development Integration of Green Infrastructure, Bio-Diversity and other relevant strategies and action plans with the economic and housing development proposed in the Local Plan so that it is clear where the policies are in conflict with each other, and how the conflict is to be resolved bearing in mind the Local Authority's responsibility to maintain and enhance the natural environment.</p> | | | <p>outlines the importance of providing a green space strategy, which could include future provision of allotments to encourage local food production. The Local Plan advocates the minimisation of waste production and the re-use and recovery of waste materials e.g. recycling, composting and energy from waste recovery (Policy S10.13, now S7.9).</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 899184 | | | LP20151072 | Regarding Site 14: I would like to express my strong support for the removal of the land at the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton from the list of potential development sites and its retention as open, green space. This is an important plot of land for the local community. I feel that the local infrastructure would not support the development of this site. | | Introduction 1 | Support noted. Benton Curve and Triangle are not included in this of the Local Plan as suggested development sites and are proposed to be retained as green space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151073 | Green Party 1. The Regional Context 1.33 We note that the Regional Spatial Strategy was abolished in 2013 and therefore no longer dictates the number of houses NT Council is required to build over the next 15 years. The decisions made on this matter have been therefore discretionary and determined on the basis of consultation with residents and others on preferred growth options undertaken in 2013. We further note that, as indicated in your document Consultation November 2013 in relation to the consultation on growth options, that: The responses demonstrate that a lower level of growth is desired by the people of North Tyneside, with the majority of respondents supporting at the lower level of growth or finding an alternative option. However this Local Plan is based on a higher level of growth. We are of the view that this level of growth is unachievable as well as undesirable and not wanted by the residents of the borough. While we think it is likely that the Council has opted for the higher growth because of pressure from central government it is important to note that Durham County's Local Plan has been rejected by the Inspector | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Planning Inspectorates decision on the Durham Local Plan has stressed the importance to working closely with partners and neighbouring local authorities to ensure that the objectives and growth targets in the Local Plan are deliverable. The evidence produced from independent consultants on levels of growth in North Tyneside are supported by neighbouring authorities and the reality of recent planning appeals at places such as Scaffold Hill near Holystone, Whitehouse Farm near West Moor and Station Road at Wallsend have all reinforced the need for the Council to bring forward additional sites to meet the levels of growth forecast. Aiming for a low level of growth would in all likelihood result in a Local Plan for North Tyneside that would be rejected by an independent inspector. The inspector would be applying central government guidance to examine the Local Plan and consider if the Borough was making provision for its future objectively assessed development needs. Through the Local Plan process the Council intends to develop a Plan led approach to future growth so the issues of new | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | for being too ambitious in its growth plans. North Tyneside Council might well find itself in the same situation because the Plan for economic and particularly housing development is not achievable given the land available. | | | development can be considered collectively delivering benefits to existing and future communities. | |
| 792500 | | | LP20151074 | Site 14: We are very happy that this area has been removed from the Local Plan - it is a totally impractical area of land to be used for housing, there is massive local community support to not only preserve this land but to be able to utilise it - as it has been previously - until recently - by way of allotments and community space and we have demonstrated this by gaining over 110 local names on a petition of support in an application for Designated Green Space and the forming of the Benton Triangle Community Action Group. see us on www.betontriangle.com Therefore we wish to express our strong support for the permanent removal of the land at the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton from the list of potential development sites and its retention as an official designated Green Space. | | Introduction 1 | Assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, has determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. As a result the site will not be selected as a preferred residential allocation. Following designation as open space through the Local Plan, any proposal for alternative use of the site, including for residential development, would be assessed on individual merit in light of relevant policies. As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. The proposals for a Local Green Space designation have arisen from the representations of Benton Triangle Action Group and it was necessary to undertake an assessment of the appropriateness of such a designation through the Local Plan process. However, following assessment in accordance with the criteria provided in the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | NPPF, it is recommended that this site would not be suitable for designation as formal Local Green Space. Further information on the assessment process is available in the relevant accompanying documentation. | |
| 805535 | | | LP20151076 | AS7.4.-(d) Access and transport strategy- Killingworth Way, Great Lime Road, Shiremoor By-pass. - Rake Lane, Earsdon By-pass. Why was Killingworth lane B 1317 not mentioned ? As new junctions are proposed from the K / Moor S.Site, at present, it is a very busy rat run at peak times as is Simonside Way - East Bailey). North Tyneside Council is spending Â£150million on road infrastructure over the next 5 years. However I am concerned as at present these roads are at full capacity at peak times ! The additional traffic generated by the proposed 2 strategic sites will cause gridlock from Monkseaton to Longbenton / Gosforth Park area. I have spoken to many people who think a new junction is proposed on the A19 from one of the proposed K / Moor roads, the reason for this is they do not know at present a public footpath, farmers lane and tunnel exists (which is only 5.4 metres wide x 4.2 metres high) through the embankment of the A19, and leads to a roundabout on the Shiremoor By-Pass. On the N.T.C. L.P. map the latter section of proposed new road from the tunnel to Shiremoor By-pass is totally obscured, as 'Northumberland park ' is written across the route. Hence people think a new junction on to the A19 is proposed. The tunnel is only 5.4 metres wide, enough for 2 cars to pass, but no | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. Future transport assessments for both Murton and Killingworth Moor would consider the impact on the surrounding transport network and provide more detailed designs of the routes and connections to the existing highway network. This would need to include the roads passing under the A19 from the Killingworth Moor site and connecting to the Shiremoor by-pass. The layout of these routes will be improved on future versions of the Maps to ensure that it is not obscured by text. The specific references to the future highway network proposed through the Killingworth site in Policy AS7.4 (now S4.4) (d) would aim to reduce the impact on the surrounding network, such as the B1317. Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. The North West North West Communities sub-area is recognised in the Local Plan with the proposed allocations of employment at Indigo Park and housing at Annitsford Farm. The North West is surrounded by Greenbelt and having undertaken an assessment of | Comment noted. Future transport assessments for both Murton and Killingworth Moor would consider the impact on the surrounding transport network and provide more detailed designs of the routes and connections to the existing highway network. This would need to include the roads passing under the A19 from the Killingworth Moor site and connecting to the Shiremoor by-pass. The layout of these routes will be improved on future versions of the Maps to ensure that it is not obscured by text. The future highway network proposed through the Killingworth site in Policy AS7.4 (now S4.4) (d) would aim to reduce the impact on the surrounding network, such as the B1317. Traffic impacts from the amount of |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>room for a pedestrian footpath ! Killingworth Open Break. This is very welcome for the open aspect and wild life corridor it brings. Could we have another open break plus a re-designated wild life corridor between the housing estates that back on to Killingworth Lane (B1317) and the Proposed developments on K / Moor and Holystone, or redefine the open break(-the only reason the break is as defined on the map is because of the issues with Methane gas caused because of the filling in of the old tip, which again you cannot build on!). Thus avoiding the use of the powerlines as a wildlife corridor- Running from the Seaton Burn waggon way wildlife corridor along the side of the B1317 road to the old R.E.M.E. site which has planning permission for Bellway housing. This would stop the merging of communities and retain a measure of green open space on the upper East side of Killingworth Moor, and fulfil objectives of AS7.4 (d.& e.) Also S8.4, (c, d,) +8.20. - e.g.- " Green infrastructure corridors must be safeguarded through S.S. Allocations. Major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identity, maintaining amenity space and access to the countryside and biodiversity".. This would stop the urban sprawl of the Killingworth estate joining in with the new proposed housing estate. "Wildlife corridors allow movement of wildlife between areas of habitat, linking sites and reducing the risk of isolated populations becoming unstable and</p> | | | <p>the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary. Having considered the extent of development required to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough, there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current Plan period without requiring a further review of the Green Belt.</p> | <p>employment growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. The North West North West Communities sub-area is recognised in the Local Plan with the proposed allocations of employment at Indigo Park and housing at Annitsford Farm. The North West is surrounded by Greenbelt and having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary. Having considered the extent of development required to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough, there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current Plan period without requiring a</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>dying out. Therefore it is important the network of wildlife sites and links between them is maintained and enhanced ". there is evidence to prove that electricity pylon routes are of no use as wildlife corridors. Study suggests pylons and wires that stretch across many landscapes are having a worldwide impact on wildlife! Power lines are seen as glowing and flashing bands across the sky by many animals, research has revealed. Scientists knew many creatures avoid power lines but the reason why was mysterious as they are not impassable physical barriers. Now, a new understanding of just how many species can see the ultraviolet light "" which is invisible to humans "" has revealed the major visual impact of the power lines."It was a big surprise but we now think the majority of animals can see UV light," said Professor Glen Jeffery, a vision expert at University College London. "There is no reason why this phenomenon is not occurring around the world."Dr Nicolas Tyler, an ecologist at UIT The Arctic University of Norway and another member of the research team, said: "The flashes occur at random in time and space, so the power lines are not grey and passive, but seen as lines of light flashing."He said the discovery has global significance: "The loss and fragmentation of habitat by infrastructure is the principle global threat to biodiversity "" it is absolutely major. Roads have always got particular attention but this will push power lines right up the list of offenders." The avoidance of power lines can interfere with migration routes, breeding grounds and</p> | | | | <p>further review of the Green Belt. Not all biodiversity and geodiversity avoid electricity pylons. The Wildlife Corridors which run along the Pylons provide key connections to other important Green infrastructure elements within the borough. On the Killingworth site, additional Wildlife Corridor's have been identified to further enhance the wildlife links within the area.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>grazing for both animals and birds. Autopsies on dozens of mammals from zoos and abattoirs showed their eyes were able to see UV, including cattle, cats, dogs, rats, bats, okapi, red pandas and hedgehogs. Also on the list were reindeer and further work published in the journal Conservation Biology showed these animals, whose eyes are specially adapted to the dark Arctic winters, are particularly sensitive to UV light. UV vision helps reindeer find plants in snow cover, but in the depths of winter their wide irises and sensitive eyes means the power lines appear particularly bright. The avoidance of power lines had been explained in the past by the corridors cut through forests to accommodate them, where animals would be exposed in the open to predators. Around the world, Tyler said: "There are hundred of examples of animals avoiding power lines. Now we know that, not only do these clear-cut corridors mean exposure to predators, at the same time there is this damn thing flashing at you."Jeffery said burying all power cables would be unrealistically expensive but added that one idea would be to put a non-conducting shield around the cable to screen it from view. The UV light, which is caused by electricity ionising the air around cables, are a major source of inefficiency for electricity companies and also cause the hissing or crackling noises sometimes heard. Power companies already use helicopter-mounted UV cameras to monitor power cables, because the flashes can be an early sign of conduction problems, but the cameras only</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>record a very narrow range of UV. "Animals see across the range, so the intensity of light seen by them is much more than seen by the helicopter flights," said Jeffery. The new research was funded by the UK's Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council. There is also the issue of the many research papers on powerlines & childhood leukaemia-this is why you have designated the route under the powerlines as the wildlife corridor, because you cannot build houses in close proximity to the power lines. As" the North West Communities sub-area is a priority area for investment regeneration". Could more be achieved in this area, As AS1,6 (4,43) states "the North West Area well served by major road network A1,A19,A189 and is uniquely placed as gateway into N.T. from Newcastle and Northumberland". Indigo Park is welcomed but could another employment park be sited on the northern border ? AS1,6 (4,48) states." The N.W. Area at present projecting a poor image which can be a discouragement to investors and visitors". The area also has surplus school places at both junior and high school level. Why build all of the housing on two sites with already congested road networks? Surely the better option would be to also utilise the Annitsford area with its much better access to the major road network. Robert Marchbanks</p> | | | | |
| 466886 | | RESIDENT | LP20151090 | <p>First of all, the fact of having to register and create an account and password will put off many people from entering their thoughts - it should be more simple and faster to add</p> | | Introduction 1 | <p>The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside places a requirement on the</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>comments. My thoughts on the plan are quite plain - North Tyneside Council seem to be intent on ripping up any open space, green fields and suchlike and filling the space with houses to the detriment of local residents and wildlife. If these plans go ahead then areas such as Benton, Wallsend and Palmersville presently bordered with fields will meld into one indistinguishable urban area, clogged with cars and lacking in green spaces to enjoy and wildlife that used to live there. Even without taking into account the lowering of quality of life due to the loss of green fields, the roads around Longbenton, Benton, Wallsend, and Palmersville are already very busy places, with drivers getting increasing frustrated with longer journeys, if these plans go ahead - then the area will be in total gridlock at busy times. I am a resident of West Moor and in the near future will see the much loved fields of Whitehouse Farm destroyed for a huge executive housing estate (at least 2 car households), this development alone is going to cause traffic chaos, imagine how it will be if the plans go ahead... Finally, people love open spaces - cycling, dog walking and just watching wildlife brightens up peoples lives and helps their mental well-being. Please North Tyneside Council, think very carefully before ripping up the fields, please think about using existing brownfield areas first and in a creative way. Once the fields are gone, they're gone for ever...</p> | | | <p>authority to plan for growth due to the guidance from national government guidance (NPPF). Without an up to date Local Plan future development within the Borough will happen on an ad hoc basis and the reality of recent planning appeals at places such as Scaffold Hill near Holystone, Whitehouse Farm, near West Moor and Station Road at Wallsend have all reinforced the need for the Council to bring forward additional sites to meet the levels of growth being forecast. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM5.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' (now DM2.2) and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. A number of constraints lie within the proposed development sites, whether its wildlife corridors or flood zones which will result in smaller site areas for some sites. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. The</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of infrastructure to support the levels of growth proposed in the Local Plan is reflected in Policy S10.13 (now 7.1) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements (including along the A191) to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151091 | The Green Party is concerned about the future and the condition of our local communities which we will be passing on to our children and grandchildren in the context of the planet as a whole. We subscribe to the notion of sustainable development as a framework within which to assess proposed changes to the local environment. Sustainable development has 3 dimensions, all of which have equal value: social, environmental and economic. Economic and social growth have to be balanced against the impact on the environment. There are two other key considerations: the impact of climate change and the finite resources of the planet on which we live and depend upon for our food and wellbeing. Where climate change is concerned increasing instability of weather conditions worldwide is already having an impact upon food production and hence food prices here. We have seen increasing frequency of floods, droughts and strong | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The NPPF advises that Local Planning Authorities need to make decisions in accordance with achieving sustainable development and sets out the approaches they should take in doing so. Policy DM2.1 (now DM1.3) reflects this intention 'The Council will work pro-actively with applicants to jointly find solutions that mean proposals can be approved wherever possible that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area through the Development Management process and application of the policies of the Local Plan.'. The First Objective of the Local Plan is to promote the renewable energy sector and developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption, whilst improving the Borough's resilience to the effects of climate change, this is reflected in Policy S1.1, Policy DM2.2, DM7.5, S7.1 (now S1.4, DM4.5 and S4.1). The Council has to provide for the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>winds all of which have a detrimental effect on our natural and built environment. The government's Environmental Audit Committee has recently (March 2015) warned on the climate change adaptation challenge. Despite the Government's National Adaptation Programme (NAP) putting the UK ahead of many countries in preparing for the impacts of climate change, the Environmental Audit Committee has warned that it has not identified proactive adaptation policies and there is no sense that we are tackling the priority climate risks. There is nothing in this Local Plan which indicates that North Tyneside Council is taking climate change seriously. And as Naomi Klein warns: "We know that if we continue on our current path of allowing emissions to rise year after year climate change will change everything about our world. And we don't have to do anything to bring about this future. All we have to do is nothing" (This Changes Everything quoted in the Guardian 7th March 2015). This Local Plan must make provision for the actions that must take place in this borough to reduce carbon emissions and protect its residents as far as possible from the consequences of climate change. Where the finite resources of the planet is concerned, the assumption of perpetual economic growth is unsustainable (and leads, together with climate change, to competition for resources, war, and large scale migration of people which we are already seeing). This doesn't mean that no economic development is possible but it does mean that such development has to recycle as</p> | | | <p>future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth and therefore Low Growth Option was not a suggested option at the last stage of consultation. The Councils intention to prioritise delivery of housing on brown field land is reflected in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1), but when allocating sites for new development there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM8.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' (now DM5.2) and wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1 , DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now S5.1, DM5.2, DM5.4 and DM5.5) with the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. The approach of the Local Plan is to set the policy framework that can be applied to proposals. Where there are overlapping interests on a site these issues will need to be discussed on a site by site basis applying the relevant policies that are applicable. Each Policy has been reviewed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan which sets out the environmental, social and economic</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>much as possible as well as contribute to the reduction in carbon emissions therefore promote recycled and recyclable goods, goods and services which promote energy efficiency and prioritise goods which have long lives as opposed to those which need frequent replacement. The implications of these concerns for the Local Plan are: "ç Economic growth has to be balanced against environmental and social considerations in particular reduction in carbon emissions and the impact of climate change "ç Opportunities for food production "" and therefore land use - should be included in plans for economic growth "ç Opportunities for waste reduction and waste recycling into products maximized "ç Opportunities for energy production maximized including both generation and preservation/insulation The borough of North Tyneside has great potential for the creation of a more sustainable society for both present and future residents. The Local Plan should be a vehicle through which this can be achieved. In order to do this however the Local Plan needs to be amended in a number of key areas: "ç Lower Growth Option for population and therefore economic and housing growth "ç Specific attention given to sustainability in terms of energy generation, food production, clean air and water and other essentials to the wellbeing of residents "ç Giving the Local Authority's responsibility to maintain and enhance the natural environment equal weight to that of economic and housing development "ç Integration of Green Infrastructure, Bio-Diversity and other</p> | | | <p>implications of the suggested policy contained in the Plan. This is to ensure that the preferred policy options are the most sustainable relative to other alternative options that could have been pursued. The Sustainability Appraisal can be viewed on the Council website. Within the two large areas of development at Murton and Killingworth Moor Policy AS7.4 (now S4.4) outlines the importance of providing a green space strategy, which could include future provision of allotments to encourage local food production. The Local Plan advocates the minimisation of waste production and the re-use and recovery of waste materials e.g. recycling, composting and energy from waste recovery (now Policy S7.7).</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>relevant strategies and action plans with the economic and housing development proposed in the Local Plan so that it is clear where the policies are in conflict with each other, and how the conflict is to be resolved "" bearing in mind the Local Authority's responsibility to maintain and enhance the natural environment. 1. The Regional Context 1.33 We note that the Regional Spatial Strategy was abolished in 2013 and therefore no longer dictates the number of houses NT Council is required to build over the next 15 years. The decisions made on this matter have been therefore discretionary and determined on the basis of consultation with residents and others on preferred growth options undertaken in 2013. We further note that, as indicated in your document Consultation November 2013 in relation to the consultation on growth options, that: "The responses demonstrate that a lower level of growth is desired by the people of North Tyneside, with the majority of respondents supporting at the lower level of growth or finding an alternative option." However this Local Plan is based on a higher level of growth. We are of the view that this level of growth is unachievable as well as undesirable and not wanted by the residents of the borough. While we think it is likely that the Council has opted for the higher growth because of pressure from central government it is important to note that Durham County's Local Plan has been rejected by the Inspector for being too ambitious in its growth plans. North Tyneside Council might well find itself</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | in the same situation because the Plan for economic and particularly housing development is not achievable given the land available. | | | | |
| 899278 | | | LP20151111 | The North Tyneside Plan claims to be a vision and plan for all residents but in my view does not take sufficient account of the needs, interests, aspirations and potential of the children and young people who currently live in the Borough and the additional children who will live in NT as a result of the new housing developments. North Tyneside is in many ways a great place for children to live, to go to nursery, to go to school, to play and to grow up in. It has outstanding beaches, parks, schools, children's centres and green spaces. In addition it has a unique world class adventure playground and an equally unique and outstanding countryside centre. As well as places and spaces, North Tyneside also has special people and vibrant and distinctive communities. Parents, carers, grandparents and professionals who are supportive of children, their learning, development, health and play. Planning needs to create the infrastructure which is sensitive to children of different ages and abilities and supports the adults who care for them. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Local Plan sets out in its objectives the needs of young people and the growth projections incorporate the demographic changes within the Borough, therefore planning for the housing, employment, recreation and necessary infrastructure for future generations. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899291 | | | LP20151119 | I would like to register my concern and objection to the further development of residential and commercial buildings in the Benton area. The infrastructure in this area due to existing developments in Benton and surrounding areas is already under pressure. There is major road congestion on Whitley Rd and Station Rd at rush hours each day, | | Introduction 1 | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | resulting in drivers using Thornhill Rd and Grange Avenue as a rat run. The pressure on this junction will only continue. I also have concerns about the pressure on local service such as Doctor and school as well as the loss of green fields and wildlife. | | | wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | |
| 899298 | | | LP20151123 | The overall structure of the plan lacks imagination and a systematic consideration of the integrated needs of the community, housing, employment, transport and quality of life. It would appear that the preferred options of commercial builders, large uncomplicated spaces, have been proposed on the basis that otherwise there will be a cost of appeals. I would like my Council to take a more creative approach which utilises the key resources of the region, i.e. not just the land within the plan but also how residents interact with the surrounding areas - Council boundaries are invisible to residents. Key under-utilised resources are the river and rail infrastructure, passenger services are required for the development of employment yet the current plan only employs the road network which is currently beyond its practical capacity. The viability of the Region requires an integrated approach by all the local Councils to support the movement of people by public transport which could be satisfied by services along the river. The most compelling advantage of this is that the main infrastructure exists, all that is needed are landing points, Dunstan to North Shields would open up significant parts of the Regions brown field potential. The Metro has capacity, subject to some signalling and track upgrade, | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to integrate a range of complex issues to present a Plan that provides for future homes and jobs with adequate infrastructure in a manner to improve the quality of life and reduce the need to travel – Policy S1.1. The Council is working in cooperation with its neighbouring authorities to determine the impact of each Local Plans impact on the future of their areas. One example of this is the proposed Ashington, Blyth and Tyne railway line that Northumberland County Council is supporting. The North Tyneside Local Plan has identified safeguarded land of the proposed route through the Borough to secure the ambitions of Northumberland County Council. The proposals for ferry transportation up and down the Tyne have been considered previously but have never been taken up. The Local Plan would support alternative forms of travel to ‘secure a comprehensive, integrated, safe, accessible, and efficient public transport network’ – Policy S10.3 (now S7.3), but the Local Plan would not be responsible for the provision of a ferry service. Wildlife corridors have been suggested in Policy DM8.2 (now DM5.2) in cooperation with local biodiversity officers from adjoining | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | to increase capacity but again this requires an integrated approach by all the Councils which is not demonstrated by this plan and therefore leaves each Council to stand alone against the lawyers of the large housing firms who have no interest in the quality of life in the housing they produce or responsible attitude to their accumulated impact on the community. Fundamentally the areas marked as 'wildlife corridors' and 'buffer zones' are inadequate, the only option which would provide sustainable communities is to integrate within the region without each Council attempting to meet every target. | | | authorities with the intention to have a strategic approach to green links that connect authorities. | |
| 898630 | | | LP20151177 | 1.16e Why are there no specific policies for the rest of the borough? Forest Hall shopping area could do with some help. The café© has been empty for a year - hit by an increase in rent and high business rates, and the little greengrocers has gone. Also, with a bit of imagination the office block could be developed into flats which would help invigorate the area and meet some housing need. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. Although Paragraph 1.16(e) relates to key areas of North Tyneside the majority of the Plan relates to the whole Borough and centres such as Forest Hall are recognised in the Plan and are supported in Policies such as S6.1 (now S3.1) , S6.2 (now S3.2) and S6.3 (now S3.3). The Local Plan supports residential development in town centres to promote the vitality and viability of centres and the conversion of the upper floors to residential (Policy DM3.5), but rental levels or business rates are not a planning matter. The Council has recently invested in some improvements to Forest Hall with the intention to improve the public realm to try and create an environment people are more likely to visit and therefore create further opportunities for private sector investment. Planning can support its town centres through policies to enable appropriate development but ultimately the decisions to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | invest in a centre are market led. | |
| 805554 | | | LP20151236 | <p>I disagree with the plans for provision of sites for housing development. The centre of the borough will see a disproportionate loss of green space around the wall send and Benton areas and effectively merge communities together and reduce quality of life for residents who live there. When I attended one of the consultation sessions there was no credible explanation as to how things like traffic congestion could be managed in partnership with other authorities and the impression that was given was one of a very siloed and micro approach to traffic flow. The same applies to demand for school places etc. The areas to the North of Wallsend could see more than 1,200 houses constructed and this will overwhelm services and local communities. Better use of the remaining green space to the north west of station road would be outdoor leisure space.</p> | | Introduction 1 | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1 (now S5.1), DM8.2 (now DM5.2), DM8.4 (now DM5.4) and DM8.5 (now DM5.5). The Borough does have excellent transport connections to Newcastle but the transport infrastructure would need to be capable of delivering the growth projections. This has been considered within the transport modelling, looking at future impact and how the £150million investment over the next five years will help towards the potential levels of growth outlined in the Plan. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S10.13 (now S7.10) 'Community Infrastructure' and 'General Infrastructure and Funding' Policy S10.1 (now S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>education officers and NHS England to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth. The Council will need to ensure essential infrastructure, facilities and services are appropriately provided within the development proposals and detailed discussions are still ongoing. The Plan aims to provide certainty to the planning framework for North Tyneside over the next fifteen years, suggesting sites for different land uses, but it also allows flexibility in the details of when a planning application is submitted, such as design and layout. The Plan includes policies on design (DM6.1 and DM6.2) that help shape what style of development would be considered acceptable, but does not include the detail of visual images as these would be considered to restrictive to design professionals and difficult to enforce, but when the planning application is submitted, the public can submit their comments. The Planning team reads and responds to each comment submitted to the Local Plan consultation. The Consultation Statement (available on the council website) provides a summary of the consultation process with a detailed presentation of the issues raised by respondents and how they have been taken into account. Six weeks is considered sufficient time to allow people to make comments on the Local Plan but we shall endeavour to allow for additional time if this coincides with Christmas and consider closing a consultation on a Monday morning to allow for people to utilise time at a</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | weekend to complete their response. | |
| 899431 | | | LP20151251 | I'm concerned about the Priority Transport Improvements on the plan which show a proposed new route from the A191 Murton to A186 at Earsdon. This route passes through Green Belt land and crosses a Metro line. Also any new route through this area would seriously affect the drainage of an already vulnerable area. Why move traffic North from the Murton area to the A186 where it can only then travel South West on the A186 back to Northumberland Park, or South East on the A192, back to Monkseaton? | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. Drainage issues associated with development on the suggested Murton site would need to be considered by Policy DM5.12 – 'All developments will be required to demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of the development proposed, and that options have been taken to reduce overall flood risk from all sources, taking into account the impact of climate change over its lifetime'. The proposed new route is intended to serve the residents of the proposed new development and provide an alternative access of those in the north east of borough to the A1058. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898630 | | | LP20151277 | 1.20 Newcastle is not easily accessible by road, the westbound A191 is already backed up to Proctor and Gamble and Salters Road is starting to get backed up to West Moor. The improvements to the network on the A191 may alleviate present matters but there are nearly 2000 houses going up in that area and you propose to use the last remaining greenfield sites there to add yet more housing and industrial units along that stretch of road. The plan is certainly comprehensive, but I have found it difficult to understand and cross check back/forward to other sections, and it's been hard for me to put forward a coherent integrated argument and I've had to repeat comments in several sections for fear that they may be missed. The plan is big on statements but I see little in the way of how you will do things. For example, you say that housing will be appropriate etc. but from that | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1 (now S5.1), DM8.2 (now DM5.2), DM8.4 (now DM5.4) and DM8.5 (now DM5.5). The Borough does have excellent transport connections to Newcastle but the transport infrastructure would need to be capable of delivering the growth projections. This has | Recommend future consultation periods to end on a Monday to allow people the weekend to submit comments. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>it's hard to visualise what that will look like in reality, so it makes me less inclined to support your proposed use of greenfield land for housing. If, say on the East Benton Rise site, a small village was built that provided access to the country park, that would be more palatable than an anonymous housing estate. Or if you could create images to see what the proposals might look like - it wouldn't take much in this day and age - then people might be more engaged. Given the size and nature of the document, I don't think six weeks is enough for the average person to take this in and comment on it. A deadline of 9am or noon Monday would have been better - you would have got responses back over the weekend and it would not have made any difference to your timings. Please make the next consultation longer, and let people know in advance that it is coming. You haven't helped yourselves by running it over Christmas in the first place then giving only six weeks for this one. I hope that you respond to every comment, because each one, no matter what they are or who they are from, should be listened and responded to. This may take more effort on your part, but it might improve the feeling, real or perceived, that you don't listen. Finally, may I suggest that once you have a set of ideas/options from this consultation, and before you publish the next that you engage and discuss the options with people, or at least those who have commented. This would form a dialogue that might actually get to a reasonable compromise. At the moment you create a</p> | | | <p>been considered within the transport modelling, looking at future impact and the how the £150million investment over the next five years will help towards the potential levels of growth outlined in the Plan. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S10.13 (now S7.10) 'Community Infrastructure' and 'General Infrastructure and Funding' Policy S10.1 (now S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers and NHS England to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth. The Council will need to ensure essential infrastructure, facilities and services are appropriately provided within the development proposals and detailed discussions are still ongoing. The Plan aims to provide certainty to the planning framework for North Tyneside over the next fifteen years, suggesting sites for different land uses, but it also allows flexibility in the details of when a planning application is submitted, such as design and layout. The Plan includes policies on design (DM6.1 and DM6.2) that help shape what style of development would be considered acceptable, but does not include the detail of visual images as these would be considered to restrictive to design professionals and difficult to enforce, but when the planning application is submitted, the public can submit their comments. The</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | plan, you get comments, you go off for a while and create a new plan, then you get more comments. As a result people don't feel listened to and you probably feel a bit sore about some of the comments on all of your hard work. A dialogue may help with this. | | | Planning team reads and responds to each comment submitted to the Local Plan consultation. The Consultation Statement (available on the council website) provides a summary of the consultation process with a detailed presentation of the issues raised by respondents and how they have been taken into account. Six weeks is considered sufficient time to allow people to make comments on the Local Plan but we shall endeavour to allow for additional time if this coincides with Christmas and consider closing a consultation on a Monday morning to allow for people to utilise time at a weekend to complete their response. | |
| 899455 | | | LP20151285 | The plan proposes to build on ALL of the remaining green field sites on Whitley Road between Station Road in Wallsend and the Benton Quarry Park (sites 17, 111, 139, and 110). These are the only remaining green fields in the centre of the borough, leaving only the Rising Sun Country Park and the green belt at the north of the borough. This does not 'protect and enhance accessibility to open and green space in North Tyneside' In addition, you have added sites 111 and 139 since the last , yet sites 16, 18, 83, the land opposite Station Road near Darsley Park, a site at Palmersville, and four in Killingworth now have planning permission or are already built. I think this area has had enough development. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests and accessibility to green space are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now S5.1, DM5.2, DM5.4 and DM5.5). | No amendments proposed. |
| 899418 | | | LP20151293 | Whilst I am in agreement that more (and affordable) housing is required in the borough I am shocked by the scale of the proposals for Killingworth Moor and Murton. I live in | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Benton and travel by car to work (no public transport alternative) via the A1. Each and every day without exception the part of my journey which takes the longest is the first / last few miles getting to and from the A1 on our aged, over congested, local single carriageway roads. Do our councillors / planners live or travel in the borough at peak times? Every day is gridlock on the surrounding single carriage way roads. (A191, Station Road, Whitely Road, Great Lime Road, Sandy Lane, Four Lane Ends). Surely the 4000 + homes planned for these two sites will result in a minimum of 4000 extra cars on our old, congested, single carriageway roads. Not considering the many, many thousands of homes for which planning permission has been given but work is yet to start. Such as sites in Holystone, Wallsend, Rising Sun, Killingworth, Forest Hall, West Moor. The proposed access routes onto Killingworth moor include making use of an old country lane (B1317) and access via an existing housing estate onto Great Lime Road, both are already under significant traffic pressures. Could we not have an access route directly onto the Holystone roundabout (under A19). At present there is an access road onto the roundabout for the local Holystone residents that could be better utilised. Would it not make better sense to put the bulk of proposed new housing and employment sites towards the north of the borough, in areas such as Camperdown, Seaton Burn, Wideopen, Dudley, Seghill. - Areas which are currently well served by excellent under-</p> | | | <p>positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests and accessibility to green space are considered in Policy S8.1 (now S5.1), DM8.2 (now DM5.2), DM8.4 (now DM5.4) and DM8.5 (now DM5.5). Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. Private gardens provide an important habitat for a wide range of wildlife. Large or small, private gardens have an important ecological function acting as wildlife corridors that link parks and green spaces, often providing quiet and undisturbed routes along which birds, bats and invertebrates can travel and feed. The provision of employment land in the Local Plan is based upon the evidence from the Employment Land Review (ELR), which was recently updated (2015) and considers previous take up rates of employment land from an annual monitoring survey, which records how much is available, and how much has been taken up. The ELR also considers the market perception of the Borough and market signals to reflect which areas of employment land are likely to see future</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>utilised dual carriageway roads; A189, A19, A1. All within a close proximity to each other allowing faster travel across the borough and region as a whole. - Areas which the council recognises as requiring priority investment and regeneration. - Areas with surplus school places and little other capital investment With the above points in mind it would seem madness to site development anywhere else considering the existing infrastructure in place. However to the possible developers these areas would present a significantly lower Return on Investment than developing Killingworth / Murton would (i.e. significantly lower property prices). I would like to remind the council this our borough not the property developers', they should dance to our tune not vice versa! Could we not make Sandy Lane and Killingworth Way a dual carriageway, linking the A1 to A189 to A19? I understand in years gone by this was always the intention. Surely we have sufficient space either side of the existing carriageway to do this? With this additional infrastructure in place for the future we would then be ideally placed to open up the huge swathes of land to the north (deprived former mining areas such as Camperdown, Seghill, Burradon, Seaton Burn etc.) to development on roads designed to cope with the traffic of the future. I feel it rather short sighted to consider placing "Employment sites" and any housing directly alongside the A19. Preventing any further widening or expansion of a major route permanently. Consider the roundabout at Silverlink where the A19 goes under the Coast</p> | | | <p>demand in occupancy or investment. All these factors are considered in the future provision of employment land in the Local Plan so that it is able to accommodate future investment. The Future transport assessments for both Murton and Killingworth Moor Masterplans will consider the impact on the surrounding transport network and provide more detailed designs of the routes and connections to the existing highway network. Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough, which includes the A191 corridor. The comments that you have made to the long term planning for three lanes on the A19 have never been raised by Highways England as an issue that needs to be considered in the Local Plan as they are the organisation responsible for the maintenance and future improvements of the strategic highway network. The North West Communities sub-area is recognised in the Local Plan with the proposed allocations of employment at Indigo Park and housing at Annitsford Farm. The North West is largely surrounded by Greenbelt and having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary. Having considered the extent of</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Road, this has recently under gone major works to expand the road to 4 or 5 lanes which (for the moment) has relieved the bottle-neck. Has any consideration been given that at some point in the future this road up to Moor Farm roundabout might need to be extended to 3 full lanes of motorway traffic? And that buildings beside the road might just get in the way of expansion? Especially to accommodate the many thousands of extra vehicles that additional housing and employment sites will inevitably / hopefully attract? Surely we have enough industrial / employment sites. Just look at the Silverlink, many shiny new office blocks which have never been occupied. Even the Council had to occupy one (presumably to hide the embarrassment!) The company I work for in the previous few years looked at occupying a site at Silverlink, we were offered 5 years rent free just to move there! Surprisingly we turned it down for an even better offer.</p> <p>Finally I find the allocation of wildlife corridors almost hilarious. How are animals to move through these corridors when they run through housing estates, built up areas and busy roads? Are we to issue deer and badgers with keys for folks' garden gates, will we see foxes and stoats leaping gracefully over back fences to get to the next green space? Clearly at best these proposed Wildlife Corridors will only serve bird life and give zero regard land based creatures or the invertebrates which make up a huge part of our wild creatures food chain. Consider the Rising Sun Country Park, which like any wild area needs it's</p> | | | <p>development required to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough, there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current Plan period without requiring a further review of the Green Belt.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | biodiversity and genetic stock replenished by the movement of animals. The stag living there is a huge draw to visitors, how will the next stag arrive when the park has become an island of green surrounded by housing and light industry. How much of a "Country Park" will the Rising Sun remain, and for how long? Many thanks for giving the opportunity to voice my opinions and concerns. Kind regards | | | | |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151297 | 1.23 Duty to co-operate Reference is made at 1.23- 1.25 to the Duty to Co-operate (DtC) indicating joint work has been undertaken and that this will continue throughout the preparation of the plan. A clear statement to demonstrate the evidence of this cooperation is required (NPPF 181) this would improve the transparency of the plans preparation demonstrating that the plan has been positively prepared having regard to the unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development NPPF (182). Evidence within the SHMA (Dec 2014) indicates that North Tyneside is not a self-contained housing market, but is part of a wider housing market extending into Newcastle and Northumberland . Whilst reference is made to the interrelationship of the housing market area between Newcastle and Northumberland, there is no clear indication of the impact of this and how much, if any, of North Tyneside's objectively assessed housing need (OAN) is expected to be met by the adjoining authorities. Both Newcastle and Northumberland LPAs indicate in their | | Introduction 1 | Comments noted. The council is working closely with its neighbours in undertaking the duty to cooperate. As part of this a series of position statements are being prepared that will provide a summary of the cross border relationships and evidence that will assist in understanding . | No amendment proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>respective emerging Development Plans objectives to retain working age population and reduce out-migration. Specifically Newcastle seeks to reduce out-migration to North Tyneside (Newcastle and Gateshead Joint Core Strategy response to Matter 3 Housing Need and Provision), whilst Northumberland indicates it could support additional housing from adjoining authorities if any need arises. Further evidence to demonstrate the scale and impact of this with regard to the OAN and the distribution of housing provision for North Tyneside is required to clearly demonstrate that the Council has made provision to meet OAN of the plan area. Little reference is made to the needs of the adjoining Local Planning area of South Tyneside and if any identified needs arising are being sought or met from North Tyneside. The housing figures discussed in section 7 of the Consultation therefore require further clarification and more explicit quantification with specific regard to the DtC.</p> | | | | |
| 899479 | Save Killingworth Moor | | LP20151313 | <p>With regard to the Local Plan Consultation and with specific reference to the area Killingworth Moor / A19 Corridor, on your "North Tyneside Suggested sites for development " plan, the following comments reflect the views of the Save Killingworth Moor group. We note the comments of the reduction of new house building in the Killingworth area to "no more than 2000" however this is in addition to the many housing developments currently taking place in Killingworth, including the substantial developments on the lakeshore and the REME</p> | | Introduction 1 | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth even taking into account the recent planning approvals around Killingworth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>workshop site redevelopment which have not been counted in these plans as existing planning consent has been granted. The "Local consultation plan" does not reflect these extensive developments and so the reduction of numbers of housing on Killingworth Moor does not reflect a reduction of housing developments in Killingworth location placing pressure upon the existing resources and infrastructure. The reduction in housing developments upon Killingworth Moor as proposed by the council is still excessive for the area. The NPPF (2012) Indicates that Council's should promote mixed use developments, and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, carbon storage, or food production); however the residential developments upon Killingworth moor would not offer any rural land, habitat for wildlife or flood mitigation, and serve only to create a huge urban sprawl with no distinction between Killingworth, Killingworth Village, Backworth, Forest Hall, Holystone, Palmersville and West Allotment. Point 38 of the NPPF illustrates that for larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most</p> | | | <p>natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM5.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Policy AS7.4 (now S4.4) does reflect the importance green corridors within Murton and Killingworth Moor - 'major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identify, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside, and biodiversity'. Wildlife interests and accessibility to green space are considered in Policy S5.1, DM5.2, DM5.4 and DM5.5. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The justification for the housing figures for the Borough are included in Chapter Seven of the Local Plan but further detail is available to view on the Council website for the Local Plan under the heading '2015 Local Plan Consultation Key Evidence and Supporting Documents Schedule' or you can select the following link - http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/pls/portals/NTC_PSCM.PSCM_Web.download?p_ID=558913 . It is important that the needs of the existing and future residents are considered within the two large areas of development at</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>properties. However as indicated in the report on Education (2014) produced by AV Consulting on behalf of save Killingworth Moor any development within the Killingworth Moor site will not offer any employment opportunities neither will it offer any primary schools within walking distance outside of NPPF guidance. The current road B1317 has already seen a number of accidents and recent traffic survey completed 2014 illustrated that a significant number of drivers use excessive speed upon the road both heading into and out of Killingworth village, it has also been highlighted that the current road structure cannot accommodate full size buses or construction traffic either through the village or down Killingworth bank leaving the only option as via the A19. Should this road be widened to accept higher levels of traffic the resulting impact would be upon the existing dwellings and structures which are already close to the main road. This would result in an increased level of noise and pollution experienced by the existing dwellings, Transport Report 2014. The impact of this level of development will have a massive impact upon local wildlife and will almost totally obliterate the wildlife corridor. Resulting in reducing the corridor to only a few feet and in places the only wildlife corridor will be the main road!! The site has been shown to contain Great crested newts (Natural England 2014), Hedgehogs, Kestrels, Bats, and Owls (the latter being protected species. Indeed a Police investigation was instituted into the drainage of ponds and the</p> | | | <p>Murton and Killingworth Moor. the strategic allocations policy outlines that further comprehensive master planning will be required by the landowner/s and North Tyneside Council to ensure the provision of essential infrastructure, facilities and services are appropriately provided. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S7.10 'Community Infrastructure' and Policy S7.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers and health officials to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on the area. The transport infrastructure to support the development of each site and the connections to the wider transport network will be developed as the Masterplan is prepared for each site, but the traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. Flooding is an issue that is covered by Policies in the Local Plan – Policy DM5.12 states 'All major developments will be required to demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of the development proposed, and that options have been taken to reduce overall flood risk from all sources,</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>disturbance of wildlife and destruction of habitat without the necessary permits obtained from Natural England. Indeed recent Bat and wildlife surveys were carried out with the months of hibernation October "" January 2014 for the Bellway REME development, the report submitted to planning officers by the Wildlife group following the bat survey clearly indicated it could not be used to support a planning application. There are a significant number of reports illustrating the numbers and variety of wildlife on Killingworth Moor, and given the large amount of wildlife corridor which will be obliterated should any further developments commence upon the moor, Appraisal of Ecology Report 2014. In addition to Wildlife the original use of the land was mining, the recent mining survey, ""North Tyneside: Coal mining risk area planar€™ (2014), indicated that the Killingworth Moor area was a Development high risk area.' Construction within this site has the potential to cause serious destabilisation with the area and existing properties suffered some significant movement following the severe storms and rain in 2012. In addition to the risk further development upon the site will ""sterilise the mineral rights' to the land "" leaving no option to extract the remaining coal reserves under the site. Section 1 of the Planning Practice Guidance (DCLG 2014) indicates that Flood risk is a combination of the probability of and potential consequences of flooding from all sources, including rivers, seas, directly from rainfall on the ground or surface and rising</p> | | | <p>taking into account the impact of climate change over its lifetime. All new development should contribute positively to actively reducing flood risk in line with national policy, through avoidance, reduction, management and mitigation'. Concerns of development effecting former coal mining areas at Killingworth Moor and potential mineral resources being sterilised are covered within Policy DM8.14 and DM8.15 (now AS5.17 and DM5.18).</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | groundwater, overwhelmed sewers and drainage systems. Houses at the lower gradient in Palmersville have already experienced flooding with seasonal weather, the current information provided indicates there could be a greatly increased risk of flooding to the properties, downstream and at lower gradient than the proposed development area. We note the "'Local Plan' is based upon "'preferred levels of housing growth' however no context is give as to the actual levels of growth, making the quotation out of context and wholly unreliable as based upon aspirational growth figures and not actual figures. For the reasons illustrated above we believe the Council need to reconsider the amount of housing proposed for Killingworth Moor and restrict this to the existing development on the REME site. There are a number of other brownfield sites towards Holywell and consider the use of some of the designated green open space land near the green belt in the Whitley bay and Dudley areas to create sustainable communities who can all share the green open spaces within the area. Justine Nichol Secretary "'Save Killingworth Moor' | | | | |
| 805626 | | | LP20151315 | The plan is detailing what the council and developers intend to do so our comments are going to be lip service. Our greenfield sites are going to be destroyed and any wildlife corridors built over. The roads are appalling and incapable of supporting the current traffic let alone future. Housing will be unaffordable to locals and they are not enough school places for any children they might have. These | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted and please be assured that the Council does take account of the comments submitted but the Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>developers are wanting to build houses for profit not homes for people! We will soon live in an urban sprawl not a semi-rural borough.</p> | | | <p>already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth even taking into account the recent planning approvals around Killingworth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM5.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Wildlife interests and accessibility to green space are considered in Policy S5.1, DM5.2, DM5.4 and DM5.5. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site.</p> <p>The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S7.10 'Community Infrastructure' and Policy S7.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary and secondary school to meet the needs of the future populations at Killingworth Moor and Murton. The traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151317 | Para 2.1 includes reference to the road network through the Borough. It might also constructively include reference to the Metro highlighting that it gives access to the national rail network and to Newcastle Airport. Certainly para 2.18 should highlight the Metro providing this access if the Plan is going to promote modal shift away from car use. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The justification for referencing the highway network in paragraph 2.1 is due to the nature of the roads acting as significant characteristics to the orientation of the Borough being east and west of the A19 and north and south of the A1058. The Metro is a valuable asset for the Borough and its importance to connect North Tyneside to the wider transport network and support more sustainable modes of travel could be further emphasised. | Greater reference of the Metro connections to national rail links and the Airport. Greater reference to emphasis the role of the Metro to support more sustainable forms of travel in the Borough. |
| 803900 | Northumberland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151527 | The Council welcomes and supports the statements regarding the Duty to Cooperate and the common issues with Northumberland as identified in paragraphs 1.17 to 1.29. The Council welcomes the commitment to continuing to work with neighbouring authorities in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate requirements. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899323 | | | LP20151614 | On behalf of our Client (NewRiver Retail) owners of the Beacon Shopping Centre in North Shields Town Centre and the Forum Shopping Centre in Wallsend Town Centre. We hereby submit the following representations to the North Tyneside Local Plan: Consultation 2015 (February 2015). Background The Two Shopping Centres are currently occupied principally for retail purposes, with key retailers including New Look, Iceland and Home Bargains within the | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Council adopts a town centre first approach in the Local Plan and this is reflected in its objectives. Policies in the Local Plan seek to reinforce the delivery of this objective and support the protection and enhancement of the vitality and viability of its centres, but the Council will consider if greater flexibility can be achieved through its town centre policies. The Local Plan has a specific policy for each town centre (except of Killingworth), with the intention to | Greater flexibility of town centre uses included in the frontage Policy (DM6.5) and additional wording to DM6.4 to strengthen the support towards town centres first. Contacted the respondents with the intention to work in cooperation of supporting the boroughs town |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Forum (Wallsend), and Wilkinson, Home Bargains and Poundland within the Beacon (North Shields). At present, NewRiver Retail are considering investment opportunities for their holdings and are very mindful of the challenging commercial property environment in North Shields Town Centre and Wallsend Town Centre. NewRiver Retail is broadly supportive of the North Tyneside Local Plan: Consultation 2015 document but as set out above, we request on behalf of our Client, NewRiver Retail, that the above changes are made to ensure that the new Policies protect planned growth in town centres. NRR is concerned that in particular, the Council's retail policy on out-of-centre development needs to be strengthened. Our Client also considers it necessary to make the town centre policies more commercially flexible to enable more diversity of uses in the town centres, which will contribute to their vitality and viability. Without such changes the investment potential outside of defined centres could become more attractive to the commercial property market. Particularly in the context of the challenging condition of the local retail market, the current health of the existing town centres of North Tyneside and competition from out-of-centre retail offer. It is our Client's opinion that the Council should be doing all in their powers to direct new retail development towards the town centres. On behalf of our Client, NewRiver Retail, we request to be kept informed with progress of the North Tyneside Local Plan and wish to reserve our Client's position to make further</p> | | | <p>provide confidence and direct future regeneration to its centres. The Local Plan adheres to the guidance provided in NPPF for applying the sequential test and the Council has adopted a locally set floorspace threshold for an impact assessment, based on the evidence in the updated Retail and Leisure Study (2014) to reflect the challenging local retail environment. The Council recognises that improvements can be made in each of its centres and will welcome further discussions with NewRiver to support further appropriate town centre investment.</p> | centres. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | representations on subsequent consultation documents. | | | | |
| 808917 | BDW North East | LAND DEVELOPER | LP20151770 | The LPCD states that "this of the Local Plan has been amended taking into consideration: the comments received during consultation on the last of the Local Plan" . The LPCD 2013 Statement of Consultation contains information on the work done to engage communities and the comments received. However, it lacks reference on how the council have used these comments to inform the LPCD 2015. BDW urge the council to clearly identify what was the outcome of the consultation issues raised and how they informed policy. This will help demonstrate the plan being developed is genuinely planned, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, by preparing the plan in consultation with the local community at each stage. The council should clearly identify the outcomes of their consultation, issues raised and how they have informed the policy going forward. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Consultation Statement to accompany the Local Plan will provide a clear and transparent record of the comments recorded and how they have been taken into account. | No amendments proposed. |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151807 | To summarise, we are broadly supportive of the overall content and vision of the North Tyneside LPCD. We believe that there are elements contained within the Flood Risk and Water Management sections that have the potential to form a good basis upon which to build a strong suite of sustainable water management policies, subject to a number of amendments and alterations suggested above. However, there are also aspects of the key policies (spatial development, economy, housing development) where our interests in sustainable water management and our role | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. The Councils response to the specific policy comments from Northumbrian Water are dealt with individually but the overall commendation is welcomed and the Council will continue to keep Northumbrian Water updated as the Plan progresses. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | as the statutory sewage undertaker have not been sufficiently met and so we have offered recommendations and suggested amendments for your consideration in order to further strengthen this policy document to ensure a meaningful contribution towards sustainable development in the Borough. Overall, we commend North Tyneside Council on a number of the policies and the supporting justification where efforts have been made to holistically support sustainable development. We look forward to future opportunities for consultation as the North Tyneside Local Plan progresses and wish to offer our continued support with the process. If you would like to discuss our response further, please do not hesitate to contact me. | | | | |
| 463486 | | | LP20151848 | I notice that West Moor is not even marked as a village on the Local Plan! Please ensure West Moor is recognised on the final plan (Policies Map). | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. West Moor will be labelled on future versions of the Policy Map. | West Moor to be labelled on future versions of the Policy Map. |
| 900541 | | RESIDENT | LP20151871 | Having registered still unable to readily gain access to comment on plan, immediate issue. No further time for comments, consultation process not helpful for general public. | | Introduction 1 | The Council makes every effort to encourage responses to the Local Plan and it is with regret to learn of your difficulties in submitting comments. The Council offer a variety of ways comments can be submitted. We have an online consultation portal. Alternatively comments can be emailed to the Planning team or sent by post. Hard copies of the Local Plan were also available to view in the Council offices at Cobalt Business Park and the Borough's libraries. Feedback slips with freepost addresses were provided on the brochure that was delivered to every home in the Borough and available at drop-in sessions. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Assistance was available via the planning policy team at planning.policy@northtyneside.gov.uk , by telephone 0191 6432310 or in person at our offices or at the drop-in sessions. | |
| 591119 | | | LP20151883 | <p>Firstly may I explain why I am sending my comments on the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in letter form via email. Despite working in I.T. for over 30 years and consider myself IT literate, I found responding via your website both ominous and onerous. Not only that, when attempting to find my feedback on earlier stages of this process using your instructions I found it impossible. The documents you quoted in my correspondence from you in February 2015, appear NOT to exist! I am not sure you take into account the high degree of objections against using Greenfield sites, as was demonstrated by your removal of "safeguarded" status from the Whitehouse Farm, farmed land in your earlier and aborted attempt at a Local Plan / UDP, which opened the door to the developer cashing in on it's landbank and the local community losing it's main accessible (public bridleways criss-crossing it) open space as well as the adverse impact on the wildlife.</p> | | Introduction 1 | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM5.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. The Council makes every effort to encourage responses to the Local Plan and it is with regret to learn of your difficulties in submitting comments. The Council offer a variety of ways comments can be submitted. We have an online consultation portal. Alternatively comments can be emailed to the Planning team or sent by post. Hard copies of the Local Plan were also available to view in the Council offices at Cobalt Business Park and the Borough's libraries. Feedback slips with freepost addresses were provided on the brochure that was delivered to every home in the</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|----------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Borough and available at drop-in sessions. Assistance was available via the planning policy team at planning.policy@northtyneside.gov.uk , by telephone 0191 6432310 or in person at our offices or at the drop-in sessions. A Consultation Statement to accompany the Local Plan provides a clear and transparent record of the comments recorded and how they have been taken into account. Previous comments can viewed from the Council website - http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse.shtml?p_subjectCategory=182 | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151892 | Thank you for consulting the Natural History Society of Northumbria (NHSN) on the Local Plan for North Tyneside. We are pleased to see that the current includes some changes that we suggested in the earlier consultation but disappointed to see that others have not been acted upon. | | Introduction 1 | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152000 | Duty to Co-operate The consortium has land interests in Newcastle and Northumberland and is aware of the importance of Duty to Co-operate between those Authorities and North Tyneside. They are particularly aware of the importance of the overlap of the housing market areas and the impending adoption of the NewcastleGateshead Core Strategy and the emergence of the Northumberland Local Plan. There are examples of failed Local Plans due to the lack of Duty to Co-operate and therefore the consortium is keen to fully understand the process that North Tyneside is undertaking to ensure that at Examination in Public ("EiP") the Inspector is satisfied that | | Introduction 1 | Comments noted. The council is working closely with its neighbours in undertaking the duty to cooperate. As part of this a series of position statements are being prepared that will provide a summary of the cross border relationships and evidence that will assist in understanding . | No amendment proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the obligations in NPPF have been met. The consortium is encouraged that the Council has engaged in cross-boundary working with adjoining authorities as outlined in paragraphs 1.17 to 1.29 of the local plan. It is also noted that the Council has worked closely with Newcastle and Northumberland during its consideration of the housing requirement, as detailed in paragraphs 7.31 and 7.32 of the plan and the 2014 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014 SHMA). As set out below, the consortium does however have some concerns regarding the Objectively Assessed Housing Need ("OAN" in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1)) including in relation to Northumberland. The consortium is well aware that the NewcastleGateshead Core Strategy about to be adopted is seeking to reduce out-migration from Newcastle to North Tyneside, a point commented upon by the Inspector in his report upon their plan following the Examination in Public. The consortium considers that the North Tyneside plan should replicate this agreement and it is noted that this is referred to in paragraph 7.32 of the plan. In the case of Northumberland, their plan currently proposes 23,520 new dwellings of which 12,820 would be in South East Northumberland which has a common boundary and is linked in housing market and employment terms to North Tyneside. However, the level of agreement between the two authorities is much less clear and the consortium would wish to understand better the relationships between the two and how</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | any changes in proposals for Northumberland as their local plan processes are aligned with North Tyneside. Currently there is a lack of discussion within the plan or background evidence relating to the level of agreement between the two authorities and the consortium would wish to understand this more fully with the Council before the Submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State. | | | | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152015 | These representations are made on behalf of Persimmon Homes and Charles Church in relation to the North Tyneside Local Plan: Consultation (NTLPCD 15). The two companies represent one of the largest house builders in the UK and are a significant stakeholder in the borough with a vested interest in the long-term future of North Tyneside. Whilst there are many positive aspects of the plan there are a small number of areas upon which it is considered further work or amendment is necessary. The comments put forward through these representations are intended to inform the next stage of the process and ultimately to ensure that the Local Plan is found sound at Examination in Public. Persimmon Homes and Charles Church have significant involvement in public examinations both nationally and regionally, this representation seeks to provide advice and guidance as a critical friend and offer our experiences of recent examinations in an attempt to ensure the plan process is robust and passes through the EIP process with minimal revision. This representation builds upon and references | | Introduction 1 | Comments noted. The council is working closely with its neighbours in undertaking the duty to cooperate. As part of this a series of position statements are being prepared that will provide a summary of the cross border relationships and evidence that will assist in understanding. | No amendment proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>our previous consultation representations submitted last January where relevant. The representation is structured alongside the contents of the NTLPCD 15 but where applicable makes reference to the following other documents which have been of note, "ç North Tyneside, Green Belt Review (Feb 2015) "ç North Tyneside Strategic Housing Market Assessment V6 (December 14) "ç North Tyneside Employment Land Review (Feb 2015) "ç North Tyneside Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015) "ç North Tyneside Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (Jan 2015) "ç North Tyneside Habitat Regulation Report (Jan 2015) These comments should be taken as official representations in relation to these evidence base documents alongside the overall representations given to the NTLPCD 15. All comments are structured in response to specific policies, when subdividing this representation please take all relevant material as referenced for each policy (this may include additional paragraphs elsewhere in the rep) as indicated. Section 1 (Introduction) The Plan Period This section clearly sets out the reasons for the emerging strategy, the plan's context and the direction of travel for the consultation process moving towards the EIP, however it is unclear from this section precisely what the time period of the proposed plan would be. While it is stated to be "up to 2032" this seems vague as to the start time and the total running time of the plan. It is stated later that the plan is set to run from 2011/12 "“ 2031/32 which we</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>support as it falls within the advised 15 year minimum period by PINS and as stated in NPPF Paragraph 157. We would request that this section be amended to include a clear timeframe for the plan as all other comments and policies are then bound by this timetable. The Duty to Co-operate As highlighted in our previous representations we remain concerned as to the level of evidence provided and the overall quality of the joint duty to co operate within the North East. Recent Public Examinations (Durham County Council and NewcastleGateshead) have tested this approach. While the inspector in NewcastleGateshead was eventually assured that the level of discussion was appropriate this was in the context of these authorities reversing outward migration and consuming their own generated need. Further to our previous consultation responses made in 2014 we continue to be concerned to the level of reliance given on the outward migration trends to Northumberland. It is noted that the 2014 Northumberland Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014 Northumberland SHMA) discusses the interactions between the two authorities and suggests that 2,500 additional migrants are anticipated from North Tyneside over the plan period. Yet paragraph 6.11 of the 2014 Northumberland SHMA indicates that these additional migrants have not been built into the population and household forecasts undertaken by Edge Analytics on behalf of the Council. This is a serious flaw in the evidence base and under the Duty to Cooperate (DtC).</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | | Without detailed information upon such agreements, how this figure has been derived or how this has effected the resultant housing requirement for each authority compliance with the DtC cannot be properly judged. To overcome this issue we strongly recommended that a DtC statement is produced which clearly explains what has been agreed, the level of assistance, if any, Northumberland CC is providing for North Tyneside and how this has impacted upon the relevant housing figures. The statement should also provide similar commentary upon other adjoining authorities. Section 2 (A Picture of North Tyneside) In section 2 paragraph 2.1 the area is described as being "bisected east/west by the A19T and North South by the A1058 Coast Road." This needs to be amended to the other way round. While a minor change it is best that the document reflect and accurately describe the area of North Tyneside. | | | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152126 | Paragraph 1.15 sets out the key strategic priorities which the NPPF requires Local Plans to address. Priority (f) is the conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment. This being the case, I consider it important for the title of Chapter 9 to explicitly refer to the 'historic' environment, and for other references to the built environment to also explicitly include reference to it where applicable. | | Introduction 1 | Comments noted. | Chapter 9 title changed to "The Built and Historic Environment" and title of section within is now "Enhancement of the Built and Historic Environment". "and Historic" added to para 1.45, 3.4 (objective 10), 10.4, 10.77 |
| 805724 | | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015280 | Horton Estate welcome the Plan and thank the Council for positive discussions thus far. | | The Local Plan | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 444526 | | RESIDENT | LP2015308 | I have no further comments to make. It meets most of my comments in 2013. | | The Local Plan | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015542 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek clarification on why some sites with current planning permission have not been highlighted in the Policies Map. Many of these sites were not allocated through the previous UDP and would be likely to contribute significantly towards the land allocation for new housing developments. Not including these on the map can mislead the reader into thinking these sites are not going to be developed. We welcome the alteration to the map in this respect, however it is not clear from the map if these areas (now with planning permission) contribute towards the overall housing number aims? | | The Local Plan | Comments noted. The Local Plan states 'in ensuring the delivery of the overall housing requirement, North Tyneside already has a significant number of homes that have either been built, or benefit from planning permission and will contribute to meeting the Borough's needs'. A table is provided below this text to show the amount of homes, once these are taken into account, that the Local Plan will need to provide for. | No amendments proposed. |
| 897298 | | RESIDENT | LP2015607 | Your stated you had listened to the people. We had concerns about harm to wildlife, character of the area, schools, health facilities, and in particular the current level of traffics congestion which would get drastically worse...NONE of these were covered or able to be explained by the planners at the local meeting. | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The Local Plan does consider the comments that are submitted as the Plan is progressed. Further work is still required to determine the impacts from the strategic development sites at Murton and Killingworth but these are being brought forward as part of a comprehensive master plan (as set out in Policy S4.4) to ensure the provision of essential infrastructure, facilities and services are appropriately provided. The importance of health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S7.10 'Community Infrastructure' and Policy S7.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers and health officials to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on the area. The transport infrastructure will be developed in the future Masterplan, but the traffic impacts from the amount of growth | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM5.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Policy AS7.4 (now S4.4) does reflect the importance green corridors within Murton and Killingworth Moor - 'major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identify, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside, and biodiversity'. Wildlife interests and accessibility to green space are considered in Policy S5.1, DM5.2, DM5.4 and DM5.5.</p> | |
| 804813 | | | LP2015634 | Having spent some time studying the Consultation of North Tyneside's Local Plan, the first thing to say is that we found it | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The Map to accompany the Local Plan will be further improved to provide greater clarity and understanding of | Policies map will endeavour to be more clear. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | unclear and difficult to read. This was largely due to the colours and patterns on the map not matching the 'legend'. For example, there is no equivalent in the 'legend' to the hatching drawn around Murton (the colours appear quite different). Also, it is not easy to see how far the map represents the existing situation, as opposed to how far it represents proposed changes. For example, if the map, as stated, represents only 'suggested' sites, why does it include large sites for which planning permission has already been granted, presumably to private developers? | | | proposals. The hatching around Murton refers to the Strategic Settlement Buffer that is included in the legend but it could be more clearly presented. The map includes large sites with planning permission (which are predominantly being taken forward by private developers) so that people can see what other housing sites are contributing to the overall housing supply for the Borough and the relationship of suggested sites to those with approval already granted. | |
| 463681 | | RESIDENT | LP2015717 | Overall plan is well thought out, balanced plan that will help economic growth creating more job opportunities for local residents and also makes North Tyneside a good place to live. P.S only problem to date appears to be an increase in the amount of rats sighted near Burradon abattoir and farm. | | The Local Plan | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898630 | | | LP2015890 | 1.48 This links to the old plan. This is an error that needs to be fixed immediately. I am sure this is just a mistake, but this doesn't help with the feeling, real or perceived, that we won't be listened to. We cannot comment on an old map. | | The Local Plan | Our apologies that the link to the map within the document was incorrect. The updated map was available online alongside the Local Plan. | Link updated. |
| 805689 | | | LP2015891 | I understand that NTC are required to put forward a plan and that you will never please all the people all the time. I understand the parameters within which you are working in order to have your plan accepted by Government. I understand that you have to base your plan on the evidence provided to you in terms of future population growth etc. I understand that a labour council is always going to try and improve the lives of those | | The Local Plan | Comments noted. With regards to shop frontages, much shopfront work does not require planning permission and therefore out of our control. However, in recognising the issue, the Local Plan does include policies that aim to ensure good quality shop fronts in those occasions where planning permission is required. With regards to litter, the Planning system primarily deals with the built environment. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>less fortunate and in doing so, Whitley Bay has certainly suffered, with the centre - especially Whitley Road looking appalling with all the gaudy shop signage. However, by far my biggest concern right now is the appalling state of the whole area in terms of litter. I am not exaggerating in saying that every single place I walk or drive is badly littered - on the ground, in the hedges and trees and it is hugely depressing. I understand the cuts to services have hit hard - but what on earth is the point of trying to talk up North Tyneside as being a great place to live, work and visit when it looks one huge waste tip?? If you started to tackle this kind of problem and help make the general environment more pleasant to be in, then you may find people become more accepting of your proposals. Talking to two sets of neighbours yesterday, all three of us have recently had punctures after visiting the waste disposal site. If you want to set an example to people - I would start right there and get your people to tidy the place up - it is always in a disgusting mess and I've never seen any of the staff trying to tidy it up. I emailed the council a week ago to find out information about the Spring Clean up - I'm still waiting for a reply. So, before you build another 4,500 homes with all the associated waste/litter, please do something about this huge fundamental problem and get the area cleaned up. The wheelie bins and weekly collections are adding to the problem - it's not just people dropping litter. I followed a wagon down Marine Avenue and picked up half a tub of coleslaw, a teabag and a plastic meat tray</p> | | | <p>The Local Plan contains a policy to ensure that new developments provide sustainable waste management (during construction and use) through the provision of recycling facilities and ensure a suitable location for the storage and collection of waste (policy DM7.9 New Development and Waste). However the Local Plan or Planning system are otherwise not able to manage litter. The Council have a Streetcare team who deal with litter issues and they are aware of your concerns. Residents are encouraged to report issues by calling the team or via an online form: http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/403/report-untidy-streets-and-overflowing-litter-bins</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | that had been left after a bin was emptied. If each commercial property would just clear up outside their premises each day, that would start to improve things quickly - but there is huge apathy because it looks like the council are simply turning a blind eye to the litter problem. Personally, I would rather pay a 14% rise in my council tax than continue seeing North Tyneside go downhill like this. I'm sure many more residents would get involved in litter clean-ups if you would just make it more easy to join in and set a good example in leadership on the problem. I know I've vented my spleen here - but providing a clean and pleasant environment which is safe for wildlife (God knows how many animals are dying as the result of litter) and pleasing for residents has got to be a priority in winning hearts and minds to your wider agenda. | | | | |
| 898751 | | | LP2015905 | I would also like to add that I found it very awkward to work out how to object to these plans, and My Mother-in-Law who also wished to object was put off by the complexity of the website and the need to register. I am not even sure that I have put this comment in the right place, or if it will be counted as an objection. | | The Local Plan | We are sorry that you found our consultation portal difficult to use to make your comments on the Local Plan. We understand that people may want to use different methods to make their comments and thus welcomed comments via the portal, email, letter or the feedback slip that was delivered to every property in the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898787 | | RESIDENT | LP2015921 | Why is West Moor not named on the Local Plan Consultation Map February 2015? | | The Local Plan | The Summary Map is a simple overview of the Borough and the Local Plan proposals. It was not possible to include comprehensive information and so not every area is labelled. We apologise if this has caused concern but would stress that there is no significance in the omission of a specific label for this or any other area. We will | West Moor has been added to the Policies Map and summary leaflet |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | consider these concerns in future map preparation. | |
| 898790 | | RESIDENT | LP2015924 | Please can West Moor be named on maps produced by the Council? The Local Plan Consultation Feb 2015 is the latest example. Not surprising if we get overlooked! | | The Local Plan | The Summary Map is a simple overview of the Borough and the Local Plan proposals. It was not possible to include comprehensive information and so not every area is labelled. We apologise if this has caused concern but would stress that there is no significance in the omission of a specific label for this or any other area. We will consider these concerns in future map preparation. | West Moor has been added to the Policies Map and summary leaflet |
| 898912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015972 | The plan is based on over-ambitious growth rates . Earlier consultation showed that people in North Tyneside wanted a lower rate of growth and to save green spaces. | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The Council does listen to the public's response to the consultation, but it also has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside places a requirement on the authority to plan for growth due to the guidance from national government guidance (NPPF). Without an up to date Local Plan future development within the Borough will happen on an ad hoc basis and the reality of recent planning appeals at places such as Scaffold Hill near Holystone, Whitehouse Farm, near West Moor and Station Road at Wallsend have all reinforced the need for the Council to bring forward additional sites to meet the levels of growth being forecast. The Council's intention to prioritise delivery of housing on brown field land is reflected in Policy S4.1, but when allocating sites for new development there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough, as set out in the relevant section of the Local Plan. | |
| 898912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015979 | I would like to see the Council (1) aim for a more realistic growth rate, (2) reduce the amount of greenfield land to be built on, and (3) make proper provision for ecological networks. | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The Council does listen to the public's response to the consultation, but it also has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside places a requirement on the authority to plan for growth due to the guidance from national government guidance (NPPF). Without an up to date Local Plan future development within the Borough will happen on an ad hoc basis and the reality of recent planning appeals at places such as Scaffold Hill near Holystone, Whitehouse Farm, near West Moor and Station Road at Wallsend have all reinforced the need for the Council to bring forward additional sites to meet the levels of growth being forecast. The Councils intention to prioritise delivery of housing on brown field land is reflected in Policy S4.1, but when allocating sites for new development there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and ecological networks, e.g. Policy S5.1, DM5.2, DM5.4 and DM5.5. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151006 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | | respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse- | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money.</p> | |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151022 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents.</p> | | | <p>reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCateg</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>ory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money.</p> | |
| 899287 | | | LP20151117 | The area between West Monkseaton and Murton is so popular with local people for dog walking, runners, cyclists and to build additional housing on this land is wholly | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | unnecessary. It would also impact on local wildlife and there are unanswered questions with regards to flooding in this area, so I believe this needs to be reconsidered. | | | positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM5.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Policy S4.4 does reflect the importance green corridors within Murton and Killingworth Moor which are the two principal housing sites within the Borough - 'major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identify, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside, and biodiversity.' The Plan has to be deliverable and evidence will need to show that the existing or proposed level of infrastructure required will be capable to accommodate the levels of growth outlined is critical. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Flooding is an issue that is covered by policies in the Local Plan – Policy DM5.12 states ‘All major developments will be required to demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of the development proposed, and that options have been taken to reduce overall flood risk from all sources, taking into account the impact of climate change over its lifetime. All new development should contribute positively to actively reducing flood risk in line with national policy, through avoidance, reduction, management and mitigation’. | |
| 899287 | | | LP20151117 | The process to add comments on this site is very time consuming and I am certain if it was more user friendly, there would have been lots more comments from local residents of North Tyneside | | The Local Plan | We are sorry that you found our consultation portal difficult to use to make your comments on the Local Plan. We understand that people may want to use different methods to make their comments and thus welcomed comments via the portal, email, letter or the feedback slip that was delivered to every property in the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151131 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | | <p>The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151146 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|----------------------------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | communicated to local residents. | | | <p>network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151164 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151178 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151192 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151206 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151220 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151237 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 898630 | | | LP20151266 | Section 1.45 - The Natural Environment - setting out policies for the Borough's green infrastructure including parks, wildlife sites and cycle routes, and seeking to protect and enhance accessibility to open and green space in North Tyneside' The plan proposes to build on ALL of the remaining green field sites on Whitley Road between Station Road in Wallsend and the Benton Quarry Park (sites 17, 111, 139, and 110). These are the only remaining green fields in the centre of the borough, leaving only the Rising Sun Country Park and the green belt at the north of the borough. This does not 'protect and enhance accessibility to open and green space in North Tyneside' In addition, you have added sites 111 and 139 since the last , yet sites 16, 18, 83, the land opposite Station Road near Darsley Park, a site at Palmersville, and four in | | The Local Plan | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | Indicative plans for potential development are included within the pre-submission policies map. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | Killingworth now have planning permission or are already built. I think this area has had enough development. | | | | |
| 899479 | Save Killingworth Moor | | LP20151314 | With regard to the Local Plan Consultation and with specific reference to the area Killingworth Moor / A19 Corridor, on your "North Tyneside Suggested sites for development" plan, the following comments reflect the views of the Save Killingworth Moor group. We note the comments of the reduction of new house building in the Killingworth area to "no more than 2000" however this is in addition to the many housing developments currently taking place in Killingworth, including the substantial developments on the lakeshore and the REME workshop site redevelopment which have not been counted in these plans as existing planning consent has been granted. The "Local consultation planar€™ does not reflect these extensive developments and so the reduction of numbers of housing on Killingworth Moor does not reflect a reduction of housing developments in Killingworth location "" placing pressure upon the existing resources and infrastructure. The reduction in housing developments upon Killingworth Moor as proposed by the council is still excessive for the area. The NPPF (2012) Indicates that Council's should promote mixed use developments, and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, carbon storage, or food production); however | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth even taking into account the recent planning approvals around Killingworth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM5.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Policy AS4.4 does reflect the importance green corridors within Murton and Killingworth Moor - 'major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identify, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside, and biodiversity'. Wildlife interests and accessibility to green space are considered in Policy S5.1, DM5.2, DM5.4 and DM5.5. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the residential developments upon Killingworth moor would not offer any rural land, habitat for wildlife or flood mitigation, and serve only to create a huge urban sprawl with no distinction between Killingworth, Killingworth Village, Backworth, Forest Hall, Holystone, Palmersville and West Allotment. Point 38 of the NPPF "" illustrates that for larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties. However as indicated in the report on Education (2014) produced by AV Consulting on behalf of save Killingworth Moor any development within the Killingworth Moor site will not offer any employment opportunities neither will it offer any primary schools within walking distance outside of NPPF guidance. The current road B1317 has already seen a number of accidents and recent traffic survey completed 2014 illustrated that a significant number of drivers use excessive speed upon the road both heading into and out of Killingworth village, it has also been highlighted that the current road structure cannot accommodate full size buses or construction traffic either through the village or down Killingworth bank leaving the only option as via the A19. Should this road be widened to accept higher levels of traffic the resulting impact would be upon the</p> | | | <p>wildlife movement through a site. The justification for the housing figures for the Borough are included in Chapter Seven of the Local Plan but further detail is available to view on the Council website for the Local Plan under the heading '2015 Local Plan Consultation Key Evidence and Supporting Documents Schedule' or you can select the following link - http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/pls/portals/NTC_PSCM.PSCM_Web.download?p_ID=558913 .</p> <p>It is important that the needs of the existing and future residents are considered within the two large areas of development at Murton and Killingworth Moor. Policy S4.4 outlines that further comprehensive master planning will be required by the landowner/s and North Tyneside Council to ensure the provision of essential infrastructure, facilities and services are appropriately provided. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1)0 'Community Infrastructure' and Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers and health officials to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on the area. The transport infrastructure to support the development of each site and the connections to the wider transport network</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>existing dwellings and structures which are already close to the main road. This would result in an increased level of noise and pollution experienced by the existing dwellings, Transport Report 2014. The impact of this level of development will have a massive impact upon local wildlife and will almost totally obliterate the wildlife corridor. Resulting in reducing the corridor to only a few feet and in places the only wildlife corridor will be the main road!! The site has been shown to contain Great crested newts (Natural England 2014), Hedgehogs, Kestrels, Bats, and Owls (the latter being protected species. Indeed a Police investigation was instituted into the drainage of ponds and the disturbance of wildlife and destruction of habitat without the necessary permits obtained from Natural England. Indeed recent Bat and wildlife surveys were carried out with the months of hibernation October " January 2014 for the Bellway REME development, the report submitted to planning officers by the Wildlife group following the bat survey clearly indicated it could not be used to support a planning application. There are a significant number of reports illustrating the numbers and variety of wildlife on Killingworth Moor, and given the large amount of wildlife corridor which will be obliterated should any further developments commence upon the moor, Appraisal of Ecology Report 2014. In addition to Wildlife the original use of the land was mining, the recent mining survey, "North Tyneside: Coal mining risk area planar€™ (2014), indicated that the</p> | | | <p>will be developed as the Masterplan is prepared for each site, but the traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. Flooding is an issue that is covered by Policy DM5.12, S5.9 and DM5.10 in the Local Plan – Policy DM5.12 states ‘All major developments will be required to demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of the development proposed, and that options have been taken to reduce overall flood risk from all sources, taking into account the impact of climate change over its lifetime. All new development should contribute positively to actively reducing flood risk in line with national policy, through avoidance, reduction, management and mitigation’. Concerns of development effecting former coal mining areas at Killingworth Moor and potential mineral resources being sterilised are covered within Policy DM5.17.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Killingworth Moor area was a Development high risk area.' Construction within this site has the potential to cause serious destabilisation with the area and existing properties suffered some significant movement following the severe storms and rain in 2012. In addition to the risk further development upon the site will "sterilise the mineral rights' to the land " leaving no option to extract the remaining coal reserves under the site. Section 1 of the Planning Practice Guidance (DCLG 2014) indicates that Flood risk is a combination of the probability of and potential consequences of flooding from all sources, including rivers, seas, directly from rainfall on the ground or surface and rising groundwater, overwhelmed sewers and drainage systems. Houses at the lower gradient in Palmersville have already experienced flooding with seasonal weather, the current information provided indicates there could be a greatly increased risk of flooding to the properties, downstream and at lower gradient than the proposed development area. We note the "Local Plan' is based upon "preferred levels of housing growth' however no context is give as to the actual levels of growth, making the quotation out of context and wholly unreliable as based upon aspirational growth figures and not actual figures. For the reasons illustrated above we believe the Council need to reconsider the amount of housing proposed for Killingworth Moor and restrict this to the existing development on the REME site. There are a number of other brownfield sites</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | towards Holywell and consider the use of some of the designated green open space land near the green belt in the Whitley bay and Dudley areas to create sustainable communities who can all share the green open spaces within the area. Justine Nichol Secretary "'Save Killingworth Moor' | | | | |
| 472456 | | RESIDENT | LP20151396 | The plan is based on growth rates which are overly-ambitious even though earlier consultation showed that people in North Tyneside wanted to aim for lower rate of growth in order to save valued green spaces. The ceding of population to NewcastleGateshead is not adequately reflected in the growth figures. I would also wonder where all these people are going to work and how they will get to these jobs you have in mind. | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The Council does listen to the public's response to the consultation, but it also has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside places a requirement on the authority to plan for growth due to the guidance from national government guidance (NPPF). Without an up to date Local Plan future development within the Borough will happen on an ad hoc basis and the reality of recent planning appeals at places such as Scaffold Hill near Holystone, Whitehouse Farm, near West Moor and Station Road at Wallsend have all reinforced the need for the Council to bring forward additional sites to meet the levels of growth being forecast. The Councils intention to prioritise delivery of housing on brown field land is reflected in Policy S4.1, but when allocating sites for new development there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and ecological networks, e.g. Policy S5.1, DM5.2, DM5.4 and DM5.5. The next stage of the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Plan will further emphasise the level of cooperation that has been undertaken towards determining the housing figures for North Tyneside, through working in cooperation with its neighbouring authorities. The numbers of jobs are based on the work of economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside (2015). The ELR also considers how much future employment land needs to be provided in the Local Plan to accommodate future investment in the Borough. The traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. Further detailed traffic modelling work will also be carried out when detailed site layouts can be considered within a planning application. | |
| 472456 | | RESIDENT | LP20151409 | I would like to see the Council aim for a more realistic growth rate which would reduce the amount of greenfields that will be built on and which will make the protection and enhancement of coherent ecological networks more achievable. This will contribute to climate change reduction, will make the borough a physically attractive one without sprawling concrete estates. All of this will contribute to the wellbeing of the citizens and to the building of communities in a sustainable way. | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The First Objective of the Local Plan is to improving the Borough's resilience to the effects of climate change, this is reflected in Policy S1.1, Policy DM2.2 (now S1.4), DM7.5 (now DM4.5), S7.1 (now S4.1) . The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. The Councils intention to prioritise delivery of housing on brown field land is reflected in | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Policy S7.1 (now S4.1), but when allocating sites for new development there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM8.2 (now 5.2) 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' and wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1 (now 5.1), DM8.2 (now 5.2), DM8.4 (now 5.4) and DM8.5 (now 5.5) with the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. | |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151414 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151432 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151450 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151469 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>(inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151487 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151512 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151556 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>(A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 900011 | | RESIDENT | LP20151587 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151617 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality,</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 900101 | | RESIDENT | LP20151630 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 900103 | | RESIDENT | LP20151637 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 805615 | Lambert Smith Hampton | PLANNING CONSULTANT | LP20151652 | We are writing in connection with the Consultation of the above plan in the context of representations made on behalf of the Port of Tyne to the previous consultation issued in November 2013. As you will recall these representations expressed concern that the previous of the plan placed greater emphasis on certain sectors, including advanced engineering, low carbon and renewables, than existing business operations including those of the Port on the north bank of the Tyne. The Port made representations suggesting revisions to the working of some of the policies and also put forward wording for a Port specific policy that would relate to its land holdings on the north bank of the Tyne. The Port is, therefore, supportive of certain revisions made to the emerging plan. In order to try and move the discussion forward we have, therefore, set out the Port's response to the revisions put forward and set out further representations on certain policies, as appropriate. | | The Local Plan | Noted - further specific comments provided are recorded and responded to in turn through this schedule for each relevant section of the Local Plan. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151659 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | | <p>five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money.</p> | |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151675 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | | <p>invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money.</p> | |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151677 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network | West Moor added to the map. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | | for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money.</p> | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151686 | Thank you for providing an opportunity to comment on the Local Plan for North Tyneside. As a local resident I have a number of comments and concerns with regards to the above document (these are attached with this letter). Whilst there are positive aspects to the Local Plan, I have considerable concerns, primarily relating to policy content, landscape connectivity and the large allocations of green land for development. I | | The Local Plan | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>consider that such issues must be addressed to ensure that the future growth of North Tyneside is fully sustainable for both people and wildlife. Recent developments have produced a number of contentious issues which this plan should seek to address. In my opinion, the plan is based on growth rates which are overly-ambitious and ignore earlier consultation feedback showing a public opinion for a lower rate of growth to save valued green spaces. In addition, evidence provided by North Tyneside Council to the examination in public for Newcastle City Local Plan, stated a lower anticipated growth rate than have been used in preparation of this plan. It is inconceivable that such a dramatic change would be probable. Given this, there is no evidence-based justification for the safeguarding of additional land for development beyond the Plan period, therefore safeguarded sites should be removed. Whilst a number of alterations have been made since the last consultation, many of them welcomed, much of the plan does not to meet the requirements of National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs*: . > 81 - positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt > 109 - The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: - recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; - minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; > 110 --In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise " adverse effects on the local and natural environment. > 114 - Local planning authorities should: - set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure; and - maintain the character of the undeveloped coast > 117 - To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should: - identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation; > 118 - proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted. . The LPA should be planning positively for biodiversity, seeking net gain and producing a coherent and functioning wildlife corridor network. Many of the current allocations for development, such as sites 22-26, 35-41 and 109 do not meet this and will ultimately result in a net loss of biodiversity with fragmented small areas of habitat, not linked by a</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | workable network of wildlife corridors. Furthermore, I do not consider that the LPA are not planning positively for biodiversity and not meeting the requirements of NNPF by failing to produce a strategic map of identified areas for biodiversity off-setting, mitigation, compensation and wildlife habitat creation. . This letter builds upon points raised by the 2014 consultation, which still apply and I have added these below [NTC Officer Note: recorded against each relevant Policy] which I would like those to be considered as part of this additional response. New comments are in black, previous comments from the consultation responses are in light grey. | | | | |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151722 | 1. Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the consultation of the North Tyneside Local Plan. 2. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house building industry in England and Wales and our representations reflect the views of our membership of multinational PLCs, through regional developers to small, local builders. Our members account for over 80% of all new housing built in England and Wales in any one year including a large proportion of the new affordable housing stock. 3. We would like to submit the following comments. General Comments 4. The HBF is keen to work with the Council in order to achieve an adopted local plan which enables an increase in the rate of house building across North Tyneside. In this regard the HBF has identified a number of areas where it is considered that the plan would benefit either from modifications or further evidence prior to the | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The Council is working closely with its neighbours, particularly Northumberland and Newcastle through the preparation of the Local Plan, to consider the cross border relationships and evidence that arise through each authorities strategy. A series of position papers are being produced that once published will support understanding of these issues and how they have been addressed. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>next stage of consultation. The following comments are provided based upon our substantial experience of local plan examinations across the country. Plan Period 5. The HBF is supportive of the extension of the plan period to 2032, this is in conformity with our comments upon the previous consultation upon the plan in January 2014. It is noted that the Council anticipate that the plan will be adopted in August 2016. Providing there are no slippages in plan preparation this should enable the 15 year time horizon, preferred within national policy (NPPF paragraph 157), to be met. Duty to cooperate 6. The HBF is encouraged to note that the Council has engaged in cross-boundary working with adjoining authorities as outlined in paragraphs 1.17 to 1.29 of the plan. It is also noted that the Council has worked closely with Newcastle and Northumberland during its consideration of the housing requirement, as detailed in paragraphs 7.31 and 7.32 of the plan and the 2014 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014 SHMA). 7. The HBF is aware that the Gateshead and Newcastle Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan sought to reduce out-migration from Newcastle to North Tyneside, a point commented upon by the Inspector in his report upon their plan. It is therefore considered consistent that the North Tyneside plan replicate this agreement. In the case of Northumberland the level of agreement between the two authorities is much less certain. This stems not only from the fact that Northumberland are yet to finalise their plan but also due to a lack of</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>discussion within the plan or background evidence relating to the level of agreement between the two authorities. 8. It is noted that the 2014 Northumberland Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014 Northumberland SHMA) discusses the interactions between the two authorities and suggests that 2,500 additional migrants are anticipated from North Tyneside over the plan period. Yet paragraph 6.11 of the 2014 Northumberland SHMA indicates that these additional migrants have not been built into the population and household forecasts undertaken by Edge Analytics on behalf of the Council. This is a serious flaw in the evidence base and under the Duty to Cooperate (DtC). Without detailed information upon such agreements, how this figure has been derived or how this has effected the resultant housing requirement for each authority compliance with the DtC cannot be properly judged. 9. To overcome this issue it is strongly recommended that a DtC statement is produced which clearly explains what has been agreed, the level of assistance, if any, Northumberland CC is providing for North Tyneside and how this has impacted upon the relevant housing figures. The statement should also provide similar commentary upon other adjoining authorities.</p> | | | | |
| 808917 | BDW North East | LAND DEVELOPER | LP20151767 | <p>BDW value our involvement in the production of North Tyneside's Local Plan. We are supportive of the LPCD which aims to set out the councils preferred policies to guide planning decisions and ensure the sustainable growth and development of North Tyneside.</p> | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151808 | The Northumberland Estates support the Local Plan's intention to work with its neighbouring Local Authorities, most notably Northumberland County Council and Newcastle City Council (paragraph 1.17-1.25). It is important that North Tyneside work with its neighbours in planning for employment land and housing land, given how people fluctuate between Local Authority boundaries for work and living. Also of importance is planning for open green space and wildlife provision, particularly the possibility of providing cross-boundary ecological mitigation. While the housing figures for Newcastle are now fixed, Northumberland County Council have recently consulted on a full of their new Local Plan Core Strategy, which sets a housing target of 23,520 dwellings within the plan period (to 2031). The majority of these houses, 12,820, are focused in the south-east of the county, which forms the border with North Tyneside. The housing projections of neighbouring Local Authorities should be fully taken into account in the preparation of the North Tyneside Local Plan. In particular the housing allocations within North Tyneside should be responsive should Northumberland's overall housing figure be decreased in the submission version of the Local Plan Core Strategy. | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The Council is working closely with its neighbours, particularly Northumberland and Newcastle through the preparation of the Local Plan, to consider the cross border relationships and evidence that arise through each authorities strategy. A series of position papers are being produced that once published will support understanding of these issues and how they have been addressed. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805704 | | | LP20151868 | Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the consultation about the second of the Local Plan. It's a remarkable document which, while I have issues with it, speaks well of those who have written it and contributed to it. Within the constraints placed upon the | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. This response obviously leads on to further comments that have been responded to separately. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | Local Authority by the National Planning Policy Framework it is quite an achievement and ought to provide the basis for an ongoing conversation with the people of North Tyneside. I have taken advantage of the local sessions at which staff of the Planning Department were present and was grateful for their courtesy and openness. They give me an insight to how worthwhile your work is and how difficult. The NPPF reflects the priorities of politicians led by the competition in the market which in this instance seem to be housing and jobs "" but what sort of housing, what sort of jobs and for whom?. Planning seems to be about embracing priorities so that people are enabled to create homes they can afford in communities they are glad to live in. You appear to be charged with maintaining a holistic appreciation of all the dimensions that contribute to that aspiration that we all might share. No easy task. So balancing the three pillars of sustainable development with the political is a considerable responsibility which is evident in the document. I refer to my contribution to the first one year ago. In that submission I know that several of my comments were strategic and political which you were not bound to respond to and might have been appropriately referred elsewhere. I am not going to repeat them all here but they remain a context to explain the following. | | | | |
| 752587 | Marine Management Organisation | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151882 | Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. The MMO has reviewed the document and whilst | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | n | | | <p>we have no specific comments to make we would like to draw your attention to the Marine Planning remit of our organisation as you may wish to be aware of this in relation to the consultation. As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. In our duty to take all reasonable steps to ensure compatibility with existing development plans, which apply down to the low water mark, we are seeking to identify the "marine relevance" of applicable plan policies. On 2 April 2014 the East Inshore and East Offshore marine plans were published, becoming a material consideration for the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and other public authorities with decision making functions. The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans provide guidance for sustainable development in English waters, and cover the coast and seas from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. More information including the East Inshore and East Offshore marine plans document can be found at http://www.marinemanagement.org.uk/mari</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | neplanning/areas/east_plans.htm. Until such time as a marine plan is in place for the North East Plan Areas we advise you to refer to the Marine Policy Statement (MPS) for guidance on any planning/management activity that includes the marine environment. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. Statutory agencies are also expected to provide any advice in accordance with the relevant marine plan or MPS. If you have any questions or need any further information please just let me know. More information on the role of the MMO can be found on our website www.gov.uk/mmo | | | | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151930 | Map 1 correctly identifies the Northumbria Coast Ramsar nature conservation site. This site is also designated a Special Protection Area (SPA) under the European Birds Directive. Given its dual status the Key should identify the site as a Ramsar/SPA . Alternatively they may be referred to as either internationally protected nature conservation sites or Natura 2000 sites. The entire coastline of North Tyneside (from Clifford's Fort) is also designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) for its biological (Northumberland Shore SSSI) and geological interest (Tynemouth to Seaton Sluice SSSI). These nationally designated sites should also be identified within the local plan. | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. Map One will be amended to reflect the Ramsar/SPA designation. The map is not detailed but provides an broad overview of the Borough, further detail is available on the Policies Map, which refers to SSSI sites and chapter 8 which describes the two SSSI designations within North Tyneside. | Map amendments actioned |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 900817 | | RESIDENT | LP20151996 | <p>Apologies for the last minute nature of this email, I purchased my house at the end of January and only found out about these plans 10 days ago via the 'Our North Tyneside' magazine and a couple of neighbours. But I ask that you please include my comments as part of the consultation as they have been submitted on the deadline date and the plans concern me very much. The first issue I would like to raise is that out of 4 neighbours I have discussed these plans with at length in the last week, only one of us had received a hard copy of the policies map, despite one of the others confirming after having ordered one that you claim to have sent one to all residents and would only accept comments on an A4 piece of plain paper with a comments form on that hard copy attached to it. In addition to my only recently hearing about the building work on these sites, I was devastated to learn of the proposed dual carriageway through the middle of the fields right next to my newly purchased house (not to mention very angry) to see that there was no sign of it at all in the map in the "our North Tyneside" magazine. It was only via discussions with a friend on my street that I knew to come on to your main website and have a look/feed back my concerns. I'm also personally feeling angry about this as none of these plans made any appearance whatsoever in the local searches taken out whilst I was buying my house in Angerton Avenue, nor in those which my seller took out whilst relocating further along the same street.</p> | | The Local Plan | <p>Comment noted. It is disappointing to learn that you and your neighbours did not receive a copy of the 'Our North Tyneside' magazine with the relevant information concerning the Local Plan. The Council magazine is meant to be distributed to every home in the Borough. If you are aware of further distributions of the 'Our North Tyneside' magazine having not been received by residents please contact ourselves and we shall pass this information on to those responsible for the distribution of the magazine. We will accept comments in a variety of different forms, from hand written notes to emails such as your own; we do not only accept comments on a piece of A4 plain paper with a comments form attached. Not all the details of the Local Plan could be included in the North Tyneside magazine but it was intended to inform people of where to get more information. The Local Plan outlines the progress that has been achieved in producing a new Local Plan for the Borough and outlines the policies with associated maps of suggested development sites. Further work is still required to determine the impacts from the strategic development sites at Murton and Killingworth but these are being brought forward as part of a comprehensive master plan (as set out in Policy AS7.4 (now AS4.4) of the Local Plan) to ensure the provision of essential infrastructure, facilities and services are appropriately provided. Proposed highways works to support the development and the</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | impact it would have on the surrounding roads will be considered in the master plan. It is anticipated that the recommendations of the master plan will be included in the next version of the Local Plan, which is due for public consultation in November 2015. | |
| 901136 | | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20152061 | Thank you for consulting Newcastle City Council on the consultation of the North Tyneside Local Plan. Newcastle and North Tyneside alongside the other local authorities in the NELEP area have cooperated for some time when preparing their Local Plans. As agreed in a position statement, all seven authorities seek to retain or encourage growth to support sustainable economic growth, maintain a proportion of economically active population, accommodate the trend of ageing population profiles and meet objectively assessed needs. We provide comments on strategic matters which have cross-boundary implications and we have raised some issues for further consideration. Perhaps these can be discussed firstly at the theme meetings we have agreed to arrange and then our next Duty to Co-operate meeting. | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The Council will continue to work in cooperation with its neighbouring authorities. | No amendments proposed. |
| 808201 | | RESIDENT | LP20152108 | The village of West Moor is not marked on the Plan. West Moor should be marked on the Plan so that it becomes a community in its own right. By doing this one can see that this village is one of the smallest communities in North Tyneside. Yet it has one of the largest 'brown sites' marked as having planning permission in the borough. Should brown sites not be allocated as a ratio to the size of the community, thereby treating all | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. West Moor will be labelled on future versions of the Policy Map. The ratio of brownfield sites to an existing community is considered in the analysis of a proposed site but there is not a ratio threshold that would be used to restrict further development based on the ratio of the proposed allocation to the size of the existing community. | West Moor has been added to the Policies Map and summary leaflet |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | communities equally and fairly. | | | | |
| | | | LP20152228 | <p>1. Devaluation of homes 2. Wildlife Corridor 3. Increased waiting time for doctor and hospital appointments transport or lack of in Shiremoor area: Buses half hourly or hourly do not turn up. 1 bus (59 diverted to West Allotment) residents there have access to any number of buses on the Cobalt which is only a short walk away 4. West Park housing in Earsdon not selling and severe traffic congestion on Earsdon Road and the Shiremoor and Monkseaton area despite a bypass being built which is hardly used. 5. Money spent by the Council for Cobalt which is paid for by us the tax payer for rent. 6. Councillors giving themselves a huge pay increase. 7. Who on the Council supervised the distribution of pamphlets because very few people received them so how could they get a response from people whoop didn't get one. 8. How many social houses were built at West Park, Earsdon and how many houses are left unsold.</p> | | The Local Plan | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary therefore conserving rural land within the Borough (Policy S1.5). The importance of health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S10.13 (now S7.10) 'Community Infrastructure' and Policy 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers and health officials to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on the area. The Employment Land Review (ELR) was recently updated (2015) and forms an important part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. The ELR considers which areas of employment land are likely to see future demand in occupancy or investment. All these factors are considered in the future</p> | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>provision of employment land in the Local Plan so that it is able to accommodate future investment. The transport infrastructure will be developed in the future Masterplan for Murton and Killingworth, but the traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. 'Our North Tyneside' magazine is meant to be distributed to every home in the Borough. If you are aware of further distributions of the 'Our North Tyneside' magazine having not been received by residents please contact ourselves and we shall pass this information on to those responsible for the distribution of the magazine. There was no affordable housing provided within the West Park development but instead the contribution for affordable housing was agreed to be provided off site. The annual building rates from the West Park development are strong which indicates the developer is confident of selling the homes they are building. Issues concerning the devaluation of property, rent of Council offices at Cobalt and the amounts councillors get paid are not issues covered by the Local Plan</p> | |
| 807245 | | RESIDENT | LP20152238 | The only way I can put my points of view is as follows: 1. Totally unnecessary 2. Badly thought out 3. Over ambitious 4. More protection needed for existing rural land 5. North East has high unemployment. Demand | | The Local Plan | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>for new properties unrealistic 6. Once these rural areas are built on they are gone forever and ever 7. When all these houses are built it will result in more traffic congestion overloading of all required services. Totally unrealistic 8. A complete re-think needed 9. One huge urban sprawl being created. A place not to live in. 10. Back to the drawing board North Tyneside Council 11. Try and preserve what we have not eliminate it. 12. I shudder to think the effect the proposed new road through Murton will have on existing infrastructure</p> | | | <p>the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary therefore conserving rural land within the Borough (Policy S1.5). The importance of health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S10.13) (now S7.10) 'Community Infrastructure' and Policy 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers and health officials to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on the area. The Employment Land Review (ELR) was recently updated (2015) and forms an important part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. The ELR considers which areas of employment land are likely to see future demand in occupancy or investment. All these factors are considered in the future provision of employment land in the Local Plan so that it is able to accommodate future investment. The transport infrastructure will be developed in the future Masterplan for Murton and Killingworth, but the traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. 'Our North Tyneside' magazine is meant to be distributed to every home in the Borough. If you are aware of further distributions of the 'Our North Tyneside' magazine having not been received by residents please contact ourselves and we shall pass this information on to those responsible for the distribution of the magazine. There was no affordable housing provided within the West Park development but instead the contribution for affordable housing was agreed to be provided off site. The annual building rates from the West Park development are strong which indicates the developer is confident of selling the homes they are building. Issues concerning the devaluation of property, rent of Council offices at Cobalt and the amounts councillors get paid are not issues covered by the Local Plan | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152249 | it is considered that the Local Plan has been produced in accordance with the policy requirements of the NPPF | | The Local Plan | comments noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 901541 | | RESIDENT | LP20152342 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | | for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money.</p> | |
| 901549 | | RESIDENT | LP20152353 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | | <p>transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money.</p> | |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152364 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. The plans are very difficult to read. I have a degree in engineering and I could not work out what the proposal actually is with regards to the road changes outside my property. | | | <p>The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152387 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|----------------------------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | communicated to local residents. | | | <p>network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 901558 | | RESIDENT | LP20152396 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>separately to the Local Plan. It was considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 901560 | | RESIDENT | LP20152397 | The information available to residents about the plan is not user friendly. The information is fragmented and difficult to interpret to the untrained professional. It was not immediately clear to myself as a resident from the Consultation Plan summary leaflet that the A191 Holystone Interchange to Cobalt Business Park was planned to be increased to 4 lanes of traffic and the Interchange itself significantly altered. I believe the Council could make a significant improvement in the quality of the information and how it is communicated to local residents. | | The Local Plan | The consultation on the Local Plan aimed to encourage as many people as possible to respond. The layout of the Local Plan will be reviewed to consider if it can be restructured to make it easier to interpret. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. It was | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>considered appropriate to highlight these strategic improvements to the highways network in the Local Plan summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809) considers the impact to the highway network based on the residential development sites in the Local Plan. The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 878767 | | | LP201522 | It is encouraging that one of the stated attributes for the Plan's Vision for 2032 is for the "...Borough's residents benefit from easy access to open space, leisure and recreational facilities." It follows that large scale housing developments on existing greenfield sites should therefore be avoided or delayed for as long as possible. The schedule for developing the required housing sites for the Borough should therefore reflect this stated vision and avoid large scale greenfield site developments where possible. The commencement of the current proposed large scale housing developments on the greenfield sites at Killingworth Moor (2000 | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. In delivering the Borough's requirements for development the Local Plan needs to identify a range of sustainable, deliverable and viable housing sites. These sites have been selected from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment that has considered all known sites in the Borough and the Plan cannot rely on potentially unknown sites becoming available in future years to accommodate a large proportion of development. The delivery of homes on the sites identified at Murton and Killingworth would need to be delivered throughout the lifetime of the Local Plan rather than later in the latter | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | houses) and around Murton (3000 houses) should therefore at this stage be deferred until the latter years of the planning period i.e. in years 11-15. This will then at least allow sufficient time to see if actual housing demand merits the need for these major greenfield site developments and/or whether by that time other as yet unidentified more suitable sites become available in the Borough for future housing developments. Currently the plans are indicating that housing developments on these greenfield sites would be planned to commence within 6-10 years. | | | years as it is important that the Council maintains a five year supply of housing throughout the Plan period. The process of producing a Local Plan for North Tyneside is to establish certainty as to the levels of housing demand for the next 15 years and where this demand will be allocated. The Local Plan allows for flexibility and the policies and proposals suggested will be monitored and if they are not being implemented, or the overall level of growth/and/or delivery of allocations are not being achieved the Council will undertake a review of the relevant policy and implementation procedure to establish the issues affecting delivery. The Plan does seek the protection, enhancement, extension and creation of green infrastructure in the Borough and Policy AS7.4 (now AS4.4) specifically outlines a multifunctional green infrastructure strategy would be required for Murton and Killingworth Moor that 'retains, enhances, connects and increases the biodiversity of each site, retains and enhances any important hedgerows or tree belts, provides well integrated green space (formal, natural and allotments), provides well integrated sustainable drainage systems and provides cycle and pedestrian links through the site that connect to the existing network and town centre.' | |
| 898920 | Sustrans | | LP2015980 | Sustrans support objective 11, Ensure sustainable access, but it should be noted that delivering a sustainable transport network will require construction of a grid of high quality | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. Further investigations will consider the recommended 250m spacing of cycle routes from urbanised areas in the Borough. | Although the guidance from Sustrans refers to 250m figure it is understood to be guidance |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | cycle routes at 250 metre spacing across the urbanised areas of the borough. There is little in the detail of the plan to support and encourage this. | | | | and not a requirement for future development proposals. |
| 797386 | | | LP20151039 | NT is currently an attractive place to live and work. In part, this comes from the good balance of coast, town centres, green areas, housing and good transport links. But there is a risk of upsetting this balance. Whilst there is some growth in population, it is not great and only a modest increase in housing is needed in this area (unlike, for example, the southeast of England). Too much new housing, other than on genuine brownfield sites, will result in excessive suburban sprawl and traffic problems and thus make the area less attractive for residents and related businesses. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary therefore conserving rural land within the Borough (Policy S3.1) (now S1.5). The importance of services such as health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S10.13 (now S7.10) 'Community Infrastructure' and 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers and health officials to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on the area. The traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | |
| 856633 | Theatres Trust | | LP20151048 | One of the Core Planning Principles in the National Planning Policy Framework (Item 17) notes that the plan should take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs. We therefore recommend that the vision and objectives include adequate reference to cultural facilities and social and cultural wellbeing, in addition to the health and leisure issues noted. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted and the amendments will be reflected in the next version of the Local Plan | Supporting text to Objective 3 now includes the reference to culture. New text: Plans will support improvement to the quality of education provision in the Borough and cultural wellbeing for all . New health and cultural facilities, provision of open space and all aspects of development will promote and recognise residents need for a safe environment and an active lifestyle, reducing the risks of crime, disease and poor health and enhancing residents quality of life. |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151075 | NT Green Party 3. Vision and Objectives 3.1 We agree with the first part of your definition of sustainable development: " Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves doesn't mean worse lives for future generations. However you then go on to say: "Development means growth. We must accommodate the new ways by which we will earn our living in a competitive world..." which accepts without challenge the need for growth and competition and which, as indicated above, we argue is a dangerous and unnecessary vision for the future. In the context of the Local Plan the extent of "growth" envisaged may well mean "worse | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. The Council supports sustainable development and sets out in its objectives to ensure a sustainable future for North Tyneside with communities and infrastructure that are well placed to mitigate climate change. The Policies in the Plan seek to provide additional detail as to how these objectives are to apply within North Tyneside , AS7.4 (now AS4.4), S8.1 (now S5.1), DM9.2 (now S6.2). The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies the overall need for market and affordable housing in North Tyneside and the range and type of homes that would be meet the needs of residents. PolicyS7.1 (now S4.1) | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>lives for future generations". Objectives 1. Ensure a sustainable future We need more detail here such as specific support for local renewable energy generation (solar, wind and wave power, generation through food waste recycling (anaerobic digester)), local food production e.g. community supported agriculture, market gardening, community orchards etc on land identified for the purpose; and proposals for supporting the development of localized sustainable fishing as well as the conservation of the marine habitat. 2. Diversify, strengthen and grow the local economy. No mention of agriculture, horticulture or market gardening here, in spite of the existence of a substantial area of farmland within the borough. Using some of the open land for a range of food production initiatives would provide local food, jobs and an educational resource related to healthy living. In addition we would like to see a mention of the great potential for jobs in the insulation and renewables industries. Also the Local Authority has a powerful tool in the drive for sustainable production and services through its procurement policies. 4. Provide an appropriate range and choice of housing According to this Plan the population of the borough is forecast to grow by 23,000 a 12% increase over 15 years. That's considerably more than in the past several decades. Given increase in older residents we need a commitment to building "homes for life" which are designed so they can be adapted as people get older; and also to carbon neutral homes to support Objective 1. No reason why</p> | | | <p>and DM7.8 (Policy now merged into 4.8 'range of housing types') will ensure the delivery of new homes makes a major contribution towards ensuring the needs of an increasingly diverse and growing population are met. The Local Plan advocates the minimisation of waste production and the re-use and recovery of waste materials e.g. recycling, composting and energy from waste recovery (Policy DM10.13 (now S7.9) but there are currently no proposals for an anaerobic digester within the Plan. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and ecological networks and these policies would need to be considered alongside appropriate development proposals, e.g. Policy AS7.4 (now AS4.4), S8.1 (now 5.1), DM8.2 (now 5.2), DM8.4 (now 5.4) and DM8.5 (now 5.5).</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>all new houses cannot be built to both conserve and generate energy and these should be a priority. 8. Manage waste as a resource This should include: food waste recycling through an anaerobic digester which would also generate energy. Many local authorities are now doing this successfully. An appropriate site could be identified (e.g. by existing sewage works?). Support to be given for the development of uses for recycled waste incl manufactured items (S10.11) so that waste does not have to be exported outside the borough. 9. Protect and enhance the natural environment The plans for housing and other developments contained in this document include development on many environmentally sensitive sites (e.g. Site 9, now Site E008, opp Gosforth Wildlife Site) and across many wildlife corridors (e.g. in the Killingworth Moor and Murton sites) as well as substantially reduce the open land available to residents for walking and other health promoting activities. These plans are in addition to areas where planning permission for development has already been given, and will further compromise "the borough" rich natural environment€ . Policy 8.2 states: "loss of any part of the green infrastructure network will only be considered in exceptional circumstances" . Policy 8.4 states: "Borough's biodiversity and geodiversity resources will be protected, enhanced and managed" and "Conserving, enhancing and managing a Borough-wide network of local sites and wildlife corridors "!" The developments proposed in this Plan</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | appear to be in contradiction to these and similar statements. In order to fulfil the vision of a sustainable borough much greater attention needs to be given to the preservation and enhancement of the natural environment. | | | | |
| 805543 | | | LP20151084 | Sadly this plan automatically destroys LPCD Objective 9. The council's main objective, just like the previous Tory council, is to cover North Tyneside with bricks no matter what the cost. The vast increase in housing (with no additional amenities) and the corresponding explosion of traffic will make North Tyneside the place not to live. Further, the dramatic increase in housing will guarantee future flooding run-off into Wallsend (and Walkergate) where water levels are rising rapidly and many homes now require submersible pumps. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary therefore conserving rural land within the Borough (Policy S3.1). The importance of services such as health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S10.13 (now S7.10) 'Community Infrastructure' and S10.1 (now S7.1) 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers and health officials to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on the area. The traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. . Flooding is an issue that is covered by Policy 5.11 - 5.15 in the Local Plan – Policy DM5.12 states ‘All major developments will be required to demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of the development proposed, and that options have been taken to reduce overall flood risk from all sources, taking into account the impact of climate change over its lifetime. All new development should contribute positively to actively reducing flood risk in line with national policy, through avoidance, reduction, management and mitigation’. | |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151093 | Green Party 3.1 We agree with the first part of your definition of sustainable development: "Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves doesn't mean worse lives for future generations". However you then go on to say: "Development means growth. We must accommodate the new ways by which we will earn our living in a competitive world" which accepts without challenge the need for growth and competition and which, as indicated above, we argue is a dangerous and unnecessary vision for the future. In the context of the Local Plan the extent of "growth" envisaged may well mean "worse lives for future generations" . Objectives 1. Ensure a sustainable future We need more detail here "" such as specific support for local renewable energy generation (solar, wind and wave | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. The Council supports sustainable development and sets out in its objectives to ensure a sustainable future for North Tyneside with communities and infrastructure that are well placed to mitigate climate change. The Policies in the Plan seek to provide additional detail as to how these objectives are to apply within North Tyneside , AS7.4 (now AS4.4), S8.1 (now S5.1), DM9.2 (now DM6.2). The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies the overall need for market and affordable housing in North Tyneside and the range and type of homes that would be meet the needs of residents. Policy DM7.8 (now 4.8) will ensure the delivery of new homes makes a major contribution towards ensuring the needs of an increasingly diverse and growing population are met. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>power, generation through food waste recycling (anaerobic digester)), local food production e.g. community supported agriculture, market gardening, community orchards etc on land identified for the purpose; and proposals for supporting the development of localized sustainable fishing as well as the conservation of the marine habitat. 2. Diversify, strengthen and grow the local economy No mention of agriculture, horticulture or market gardening here, in spite of the existence of a substantial area of farmland within the borough. Using some of the open land for a range of food production initiatives would provide local food, jobs and an educational resource related to healthy living. In addition we would like to see a mention of the great potential for jobs in the insulation and renewables industries. Also the Local Authority has a powerful tool in the drive for sustainable production and services through its procurement policies. 4. Provide an appropriate range and choice of housing According to this Plan the population of the borough is forecast to grow by 23,000 a 12% increase over 15 years. That's considerably more than in the past. few decades. Given increase in older residents we need a commitment to building "homes for life" which are designed so they can be adapted as people get older; and also to carbon neutral homes to support Objective 1. No reason why all new houses cannot be built to both conserve and generate energy and these should be a priority. 8. Manage waste as a resource This should include: food waste</p> | | | <p>The Local Plan advocates the minimisation of waste production and the re-use and recovery of waste materials e.g. recycling, composting and energy from waste recovery Policy S10.13 (now DM7.9) but there are currently no proposals for an anaerobic digester within the Plan. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and ecological networks and these policies would need to be considered alongside appropriate development proposals, e.g. Policy AS7.4 (now AS4.4), S8.1 (now 5.1), DM8.2 (now 5.2), DM8.4 (now 5.4) and DM8.5 (now 5.5).</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>recycling through an anaerobic digester which would also generate energy. Many local authorities are now doing this successfully. An appropriate site could be identified (e.g. by existing sewage works?). Support to be given for the development of uses for recycled waste incl manufactured items (S10.11) so that waste does not have to be exported outside the borough. 9. Protect and enhance the natural environment The plans for housing and other developments contained in this document include development on many environmentally sensitive sites (e.g. Site 9, now Site E008, opp Gosforth Wildlife Site) and across many wildlife corridors (e.g. in the Killingworth Moor and Murton sites) as well as substantially reduce the open land available to residents for walking and other health promoting activities. These plans are in addition to areas where planning permission for development has already been given, and will further compromise the borough's rich natural environment . Policy 8.2 states: "loss of any part of the green infrastructure network will only be considered in exceptional circumstances" . Policy 8.4 states: "Borough's biodiversity and geodiversity resources will be protected, enhanced and managed" and "Conserving, enhancing and managing a Borough-wide network of local sites and wildlife corridors" The developments proposed in this Plan appear to be in contradiction to these and similar statements. In order to fulfil the vision of a sustainable borough much greater attention needs to be given to the</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | preservation and enhancement of the natural environment. | | | | |
| 898981 | | | LP20151112 | The consultation states that it should "mitigate the impact of, climate change, including flood risk; ". This seems to be in direct competition with the stated plan to build houses on all of the remaining green belt land bordering Whitley Road, given that these current green field sites will be acting as efficient groundwater buffers, absorbing any flash rainfall and releasing it slowly. Once concreted over, any rainfall on these areas will run off significantly faster leading to increased flood risk further down the hill towards the coast road. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. Flooding is an issue that is covered within the Local Plan – the Local Plan states ‘All developments will be required to demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of the development proposed, and that options have been taken to reduce overall flood risk from all sources, taking into account the impact of climate change over its lifetime. All new development should contribute positively to actively reducing flood risk in line with national policy, through avoidance, reduction, management and mitigation’. The Council has not suggested any green belt sites for development. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the green belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary, but the evidence on housing and job projections over the next 15 years place a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898981 | | | LP20151113 | The consultation plan also states that the rich natural environment "will be protected and enhanced for their biodiversity and recreational value". This is an objective I wholeheartedly agree with and hope the council will back up this statement by removing all green field sites from their | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. The Councils intention to prioritise delivery of | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | development plan. As mentioned in this report, manufacturing industry in the region has decreased and this has left a large number of brownfield sites which should be utilised before any green field development is considered. The natural environment is a shared resource for all residents of the borough and should not be sacrificed simply because it is more convenient / profitable for developers to build on instead of remediating existing brownfield locations. | | | housing on brown field land is reflected in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1), but there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. | |
| 898630 | | | LP20151268 | I agree with the vision and objectives, but I do worry about how attractive North Tyneside will be to live if it's jam packed with housing and gridlocked. Green space will not be easily accessible, and the Rising Sun Country Park will just become a dumping ground for more litter and more plastic bags on the trees and bushes. The proof will be in your plans for achieving these objectives and if you have contingencies in place in case they fail. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and ecological networks, e.g. Policy AS7.4 (now AS4.4), S8.1 (now 5.1), DM8.2 (now 5.2), DM8.4 (now 5.4) and DM8.5 (now 5.5). The traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. The Policies and the evidence in the Local Plan will be monitored and updated to ensure they are being implemented. If they are not then the Policy and/or evidence will | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | be reviewed to establish the issues affecting its delivery. | |
| 899455 | | | LP20151280 | North Tyneside will no longer be an attractive place to live if it's full of housing estates and you can't get around because of the traffic. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and ecological networks, e.g. Policy AS7.4 (now AS4.4), S8.1 (now 5.1), DM8.2 (now 5.2), DM8.4 (now 5.4) and DM8.5 (now 5.5). The traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151318 | Overall impression: The Vision and Objectives appear, in most respects, to address protection for rural and urban landscapes, wildlife, the built and natural environment and the reduction of pollution. However "" there is concern that the Vision does not adequately convey the intent behind all 12 objectives. Vision: "ç the implicit recognition that the riverside sites should be reserved for specialist industry is welcome (also Obj 7). "ç we are concerned that the vision does not mention sustainability or the challenge of climate change (though it is Obj 1!). "ç explicit | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. There is a balance of the Vision not repeating the objectives but the Objectives drawing out elements from the Vision, which are then further explained. High quality built and natural environment is valued in its own right and not just to aid business success. The error highlighted in Para 3.4 will be changed, thank you for spotting this but the wording of Objective 11 will remain as it is considered clear in its emphasis to encourage sustainable access options in the Borough. | Wording amended from 15 Objectives to 12 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | reference to high quality built and natural environment valued in its own right not just as an aid to business success would be very helpful Obj 11 could be strengthened with an explicit commitment to encourage the use of active and public transport in preference to car use. Typo: Para 3.4 refers to 15 objectives but only 12 are listed | | | | |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151483 | Support the objectives as set out. As a general comment it is noted that Objective 9 includes a reference to making effective use of land by reusing brownfield sites. This needs to be followed through into the Plan and in particular in the identification of housing sites with brownfield sites allocated in preference to greenfield sites. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. The Councils intention to prioritise delivery of housing on brown field land is reflected in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1), but there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 424278 | SITA Up | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151548 | Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the Local Plan Consultation . SITA UK is a recycling and resource management company and is responsible for delivery of the North Tyneside Council Waste Disposal Contract, which runs until March 2022. SITA UK has a vision of a society with no more waste, recognising the role of waste as a resource, and as such would strongly support the inclusion of Objective 8 in the Local Plan. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899991 | Tyne and Wear | RESIDENT | LP20151579 | Overall we welcome the sentiments of the documents in relation to the aims and | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. The Local Plan sets out its objective to ensure sustainable access | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | Public Transport Users Group | | | objectives of our organisation and its constituent affiliated groups. Whilst we welcome much of this plan we think that it needs to go further if we as a community are to encourage real changes in the way that we travel and manage our impact on the environment. We need to achieve modal shift from cars to a fully integrated public transport network ,to help to improve our environment, so that everyone can access within easy reach of home or work or leisure. We need to encourage cycling and walking in order to improve our physical health to support the access to public transport interchanges. We need to ensure that individuals with mobility needs can access commercial and public services as well as being able to enjoy our beautiful environment. We need to make sure that people from all parts of the North East can enjoy the new vision of the coast so clearly set out in recent Council plans without having to endure the frustration and damage to health that comes from congestion. We need to set challenging targets for North Tyneside so that we can all play our part in avoiding the disaster of climate change for our children and our children's children. | | | throughout the Borough, with the wider region and beyond. Although the Plan does not set targets for climate change the Plan aims to 'to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to adapt to, and mitigate the impact of, climate change, including flood risk; promoting the renewable energy sector and developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption, whilst improving the Borough's resilience to the effects of climate change.' | |
| 899194 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | | LP20151641 | Objective 1 We note that Objective 1 has now been amended to read "promoting the renewable energy sector and developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption". In line with our previous representations on this objective, NWL supports this amendment. This revision ensures that developments will not need to include renewable elements which would | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. Objective 4 will be amended so it more clearly identifies that the full housing needs will be met within the Plan period. | Amendments made to Objective 4 text. Objective now reads: The population of North Tyneside is forecast to grow, particularly with more residents aged 65 and over. Along with improvements to the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | render them unviable in order to comply with Objective 1. In this respect it is consistent with paragraphs 95 and 96 of the NPPF. Objective 4 NWL welcomes the broad thrust of Objective 4 of the Local Plan, which aims to provide an appropriate range and choice of housing to meet current and future needs. However NWL do not consider the supporting text to Objective 4 to fully comply with NPPF paragraph 47, which requires the Council to meet " ... the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area ... ". Accordingly, NWL suggests the objective be amended as follows:" ... Along with improvements to the existing dwelling stock which will contribute to meet full housing needs during the plan period ... "These comments mirror our representations made during the previous consultation stage of the plan. | | | | existing dwelling stock, which will continue to meet most housing needs during the plan period, provision of additional homes to meet the full housing requirements during the plan period in sustainable locations will assist housing affordability, improve the range and choice of housing and meet the needs of all sectors of a changing and growing population, and enable growth of the Borough's economy. Such housing provision will contribute to sustainable mixed communities.' |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151723 | 10. The vision is considered an improvement upon that contained in the previous consultation (winter 2013/4). It is a positive statement which provides a degree of spatial emphasis. The HBF does, however, consider that it could be further improved by providing reference to meeting the housing needs of current and future residents. The vision only currently suggests that residents will have the "'opportunity' to live in sustainable communities. This is not considered sufficiently positive or consistent with the NPPF requirements to meet housing needs. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. Objective 4 will be amended so it more clearly identifies that the full housing needs will be met within the Plan period. | Amendments made to Objective 4 text. Objective now reads: The population of North Tyneside is forecast to grow, particularly with more residents aged 65 and over. Along with improvements to the existing dwelling stock, which will continue to meet most housing needs during the plan period, provision of additional homes to meet the full housing requirements |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | during the plan period in sustainable locations will assist housing affordability, improve the range and choice of housing and meet the needs of all sectors of a changing and growing population, and enable growth of the Borough's economy. Such housing provision will contribute to sustainable mixed communities.' |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151724 | Objectives 11. The HBF is generally supportive of the plan objectives, particularly objectives 2 and 4. We are particularly pleased to note that objective 4 now more closely aligns with our previous comments upon the plan. | | Vision and Objectives | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 808917 | BDW North East | LAND DEVELOPER | LP20151769 | "The LPCD 2015 sets out the preferred policies and proposals that the council propose to guide planning decisions and establish the framework for the sustainable growth and development of North Tyneside up to 2032" . 2.2 Para 157, NPPF identifies a preference for plans to be drawn up with a 15 year time horizon. The LPCD has a timescale of 17 years. The plan is unlikely to be adopted this year. However, the 17 year plan period is appropriate giving the council a 2 year window to adopt the plan, whilst still allowing for a 15 year plan period. 2.3 BDW would urge the council to review the plan period if it is not adopted in 2016. The council must ensure the adoption date does not affect the delivery of the plan and viability of the housing numbers or allocations proposed. 2.4 BDW | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | encourage the council to ensure the LPCD has a 15 year plan period at adoption. | | | | |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151792 | We broadly support the vision of the LPCD and its emphasis upon sustainability. In particular, we welcome the content of Objective 1, which highlights the need for planning to ensure a sustainable future in terms of both communities and infrastructure, making reference to the role of climate change within the Local Plan period. Additionally, we welcome the inclusion of Objective 9, which aims to protect and enhance the natural environment, as an objective in its own right. Sustainable water and sewerage services can play a key role within the achievement of this objective, and we would suggest that sustainable water management is explicitly referred to within this section. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. Objective One refers to sustainable water management through where it states 'promoting the renewable energy sector and developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption, whilst improving the Borough's resilience to the effects of climate change.' | No amendments proposed. |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151823 | We support the amendment to objective 9 "Protect and enhance the natural environment€ which now includes provisions for the water environment. | | Vision and Objectives | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805704 | | | LP20151869 | Sustainable Development and Climate Change. We face an uncertain future. The reasons why are well documented in the Brundtland Report, at several subsequent world conferences and an accumulation of scientific evidence expressed in UK legislation and this Local Authorities several policies. What they call into question globally as well as locally, is the ability of our species to provide for itself. Without referring to this and its urgency, the omission colludes in the present failure to act appropriately nationally and locally. The NPPF, its constraints and | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. The Plan needs to balance social, economic and environmental considerations to help create sustainable communities and these overarching principles are reflected within the policies and outlined within the Vision and Objectives. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>priorities does just this and in my view this Local Plan has been obliged to follow it. To satisfy the Governments requirement to prioritise housing and jobs invites placing other considerations as secondary. Where is the balance? The reasons for Sustainable Development and the causes of Climate Change exposes a serious risk of being unable to provide for ourselves in those elements essential to life such as food, water, energy, minerals, natural materials etc .which housing and jobs are but products of. This is not only a matter of sufficiency of natural resources but of course is also an issue of who owns, controls and distributes them. Also, dare I say it, what motivates them. In the competitive world the present Government envisages, the dangers seem all too obvious. While this a political issue, a Local Plan could objectively point up the issues involved in aspiring to a sustainable community which this Plan does not make clear and attainable. The North Tyneside Borough is no longer self sufficient in those elements essential to life particularly land and food. Those others such as energy and water we are dependant upon others for. They are not always benign. However common sense suggests that we adopt a precautionary principle by optimising our own self sufficiency particularly in relation to those essentials we could provide for ourselves. This means husbanding our natural resources land and sea. I think the Local Plan should make this clear, inform people of the challenges and provide for an ongoing conversation with local people as we seek to move to a</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | sustainable future. We are all consumers and live in a democracy. I would suggest that the Local Plan which has many worthwhile proposals, is obliged to accommodate the status quo and that is not realistic when seeking sustainability. I would propose that land, food, energy, water, air, waste, population must be sovereign, should be subject to democratic control and where possible ownership. That must be a foundation of a sustainable community. The difficulties are manifold and not always apparent. Any local government seeking to provide security for its constituency must accept the role of enabling them provide for themselves and each other. Ways must be found to insist on this, based upon the informed and objective evidence which has been collected. | | | | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151896 | Whilst a number of alterations have been made since the last consultation, many of them welcomed, NHSN still considers that much of the plan does not to meet the requirements of National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs: 81 - positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt 109 - The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: i, recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; i, minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and ecological networks, e.g. Policy AS7.4 (now AS4.4), S8.1 (now S5.1), DM8.2 (now DM5.2), DM8.4 (now DM5.4) and DM8.5 (now DM5.5). Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | resilient to current and future pressures; 110 - In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise "i adverse effects on the local and natural environment. 114 - Local planning authorities should: i, set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure; and i, maintain the character of the undeveloped coast 117 - To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should: i, identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation; 118 - proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted. | | | Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary therefore conserving rural land within the Borough | |
| 830576 | Taylor Wimpey | DEVELOPER | LP20151978 | The Vision as currently ed within the consultation plan is positive and will promote sustainable growth of the Borough, over the plan period. However, it falls short of confirming the Council will deliver its full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in order to ensure there is a sufficient amount of housing for residents of the borough. It is considered such | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. Objective 4 will be amended so it more clearly identifies that the full housing needs will be met within the Plan period. | Amendments made to Objective 4 text. Objective now reads: The population of North Tyneside is forecast to grow, particularly with more residents aged 65 and over. Along with improvements to the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | | confirmation should be included within a revised vision statement. The Objectives In a similar stance to the vts1on, it is considered objective 4 could be strengthened by making specific reference to the Borough providing an appropriate range and choice of housing to meet the 'full objectively assessed needs' for marketing affordable housing. | | | | existing dwelling stock, which will continue to meet most housing needs during the plan period, provision of additional homes to meet the full housing requirements during the plan period in sustainable locations will assist housing affordability, improve the range and choice of housing and meet the needs of all sectors of a changing and growing population, and enable growth of the Borough's economy. Such housing provision will contribute to sustainable mixed communities.' |
| 900788 | | DEVELOPER | LP20151986 | Our client particularly supports the Council's objective to "provide an appropriate range and choice of housing to meet current and future evidence based needs for market and affordable housing", as set out in Objective 4. To support the Council's aspirations in meeting current and future evidence based needs, our client has reviewed the SHMA and has undertaken an objective assessment of future housing need in North Tyneside, which can be utilised to inform current and future needs for market and affordable housing within the local authority area. Further, our client supports the objective to provide "additional homes in sustainable locations [to] assist housing afford ability, improve the | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | range and choice of housing and meet the needs of all sectors of a changing and growing population, and enable growth of the Borough's economy". It is considered that housing development at our client's site would contribute towards achieving Objective 4 due to its sustainable location in close proximity to existing housing, local shops and services, the A 1 /A 19 and public transport, whilst improving the choice of housing in Percy Main. | | | | |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152001 | Plan Vision and Objectives The consortium supports the Council's vision and objectives set out in section 3 of the local plan for the 15 year period of the plan from adoption, including the objectives to grow the population and economy through retaining working age population and increasing job growth. The consortium would however suggest that Objective 4 should make reference to the strategic allocations that will deliver major housing growth at Killingworth Moor and Murton. The reason for this is that they represent a significant part of delivering the plan's overall objectives for an increased population and growing economy and to retain work age population within the Borough including a substantial part of the housing required for the plan period and also the only new employment allocation proposed in the emerging plan. The status of these sites and the importance of their delivery should be recognised as one of the key Objectives of the plan. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. Objective 4 will be amended so it more clearly identifies that the full housing needs will be met within the Plan period and it is not necessary to reference Killingworth Moor and Murton as they are referenced in their own Policy (AS7.4 (now AS4.4)). | Amendments made to Objective 4 text. Objective now reads: The population of North Tyneside is forecast to grow, particularly with more residents aged 65 and over. Along with improvements to the existing dwelling stock, which will continue to meet most housing needs during the plan period, provision of additional homes to meet the full housing requirements during the plan period in sustainable locations will assist housing affordability, improve the range and choice of housing and meet the needs of all sectors of a changing and growing population, and enable growth of the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | Borough's economy. Such housing provision will contribute to sustainable mixed communities.' |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152016 | <p>Objective 2 is welcomed and it is considered that North Tyneside is well placed to provide a plan which is capable of strengthening the local economy. It is suggested that the positive role which house building plays should be recognised through this objective as it is a key creator of local employment and training opportunities. Despite recent years of economic downturn, the house building industry in the North East has a turnover of over Â£1.1bn and represents a substantial employer in the region throughout the supply chain. It has been calculated that every Â£1 invested in the construction of new homes generates Â£2.84 in local spending. Furthermore around 10,000 people are employed by the sector in the north east "" a figure which is likely to rise as the market strengthens ("~Lord Adonis Economic Review: Submission by the North East Housing Sector (2013) NLP). Objective 4 appears to be in conflict with one of the main purposes of Local Plans as set out in paragraph. 47 of the NPPF "" to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. The proposed objective proposes an ""appropriate' range of housing to meet needs "" Persimmon would argue that in order to comply with the NPPF the only ""appropriate' figure to provide is that of the full, objectively assessed need for the borough. Objective 9 is supported in principle</p> | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. Objective 4 will be amended so it more clearly identifies that the full housing needs will be met within the Plan period. Objective 9 is credible and does not restrict development opportunities on sites other than brown field land. | Amendments made to Objective 4 text. Objective now reads: The population of North Tyneside is forecast to grow, particularly with more residents aged 65 and over. Along with improvements to the existing dwelling stock, which will continue to meet most housing needs during the plan period, provision of additional homes to meet the full housing requirements during the plan period in sustainable locations will assist housing affordability, improve the range and choice of housing and meet the needs of all sectors of a changing and growing population, and enable growth of the Borough's economy. Such housing provision will contribute to sustainable mixed communities.' |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | as the re use of brown field land is important to urban regeneration and sustainability. While this as a key principle is supported we stress that a preferential outlook on development of brown field (PDL) land is contrary to the NPPF as such we would strongly object to any such manipulation or interpretation of this objective and its respective policies. We would appreciate that this policy be re worded to make clear that this is not a Brown Field first approach but simply a laudable aim to ensure more urban regeneration in areas that can viably sustain such. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152070 | RE New Site: Russell Square Our client supports the amended wording of Objective 1 to promote "developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption" , rather than placing a requirement to meet the "'highest standards' in resource and energy efficiency. This revision ensures that developments will not be rendered unviable in order to comply with Objective 1 and is consistent with paragraphs 95 and 96 of the NPPF. Our client broadly supports Objective 4 to provide an appropriate range and choice of housing to meet the housing needs of the Borough. Our client particularly supports the objective to provide "additional homes in sustainable locations [to] assist housing affordability, improve the range and choice of housing and meet the needs of all sectors of a changing and growing population, and enable growth of the Borough's economy" . It is considered that housing development at our client's site | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. Support of objectives welcomed. This site lies wholly in the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Assessment, which determined that the current extent of the Green Belt should be retained. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | presents the opportunity to achieve Objective 4 by improving the range and choice of housing in Seaton Burn. The site presents a sustainable location, which is in close proximity to the A1/A19, public transport, the National Cycle Network and numerous local amenities. | | | | |
| 396450 | The British Horse Society | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152073 | Having viewed the Summary Document of the above I wish to put forward a comment on the key proposals. Quality of the environment first bullet point. It is stated the North Tyneside will 'Protect and enhance our green spaces, wildlife, pedestrian and cycles routes The text in this proposal should be amended to state Protect and enhance our green spaces, wildlife, cycles routes and All PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY. This will then provide protection for Bridleways which is the public right of way which is so essential to equestrians and which your current proposals appear to have totally overlooked. I trust this text will be amended. | | Vision and Objectives | Comment noted. This will be amended and in future versions the hierarchy of equestrian, walking and cycling for public rights of way will be reflected in the Local Plan. | No amendments proposed. |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152084 | RE New Site: Land to rear Front Street, Seaton Burn. Our client supports the amended wording of Objective 1 to promote "developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption" , rather than placing a requirement to meet the "'highest standards' in resource and energy efficiency. This revision ensures that developments will not be rendered unviable in order to comply with Objective 1 and is consistent with paragraphs 95 and 96 of the NPPF. Our client broadly supports Objective 2 to strengthen and grow the local economy and provide job opportunities. Our client | | Vision and Objectives | Comments noted. This site lies wholly in the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Assessment, which determined that the current extent of the Green Belt should be retained. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>particularly supports the Council's objective of providing "attractive and accessible employment sites supported by excellent infrastructure and services, providing jobs and the homes that residents living and working in North Tyneside need; stimulating competition, business creation and increasing skills and educational attainment" . It is considered that the development of our client's site for employment uses would contribute towards achieving Objective 2 due to its advantageous location at the A1/A19 junction. Employment development at the site would also contribute towards the delivery of Objective 11: to "ensure sustainable access throughout the Borough, with the wider region and beyond" . This is not only as a result of its excellent access off the A1 and A19 but also due to the close proximity of bus services along Front Street and the nearby National Cycle Network travelling through Seaton Burn, which provide sustainable transport options travelling within and outside of the Borough. In addition, by virtue of the site's location to the north of Seaton Burn traffic impact in the village would be minimised.</p> | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152100 | <p>RE New Site: Land to south of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn. Our client supports the amended wording of Objective 1 to promote "developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption" , rather than placing a requirement to meet the "'highest standards' in resource and energy efficiency. This revision ensures that developments will not be rendered unviable</p> | | Vision and Objectives | <p>Comments noted. This site lies wholly in the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Assessment, which determined that the current extent of the Green Belt should be retained.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | in order to comply with Objective 1 and is consistent with paragraphs 95 and 96 of the NPPF. Our client broadly supports Objective 4 to provide an appropriate range and choice of housing to meet the housing needs of the Borough. Our client particularly supports the objective to provide "additional homes in sustainable locations [to] assist housing affordability, improve the range and choice of housing and meet the needs of all sectors of a changing and growing population, and enable growth of the Borough's economy" . It is considered that housing development at our client's site would contribute towards achieving Objective 4 due to its sustainable location in close proximity to the A1/A19, public transport and the National Cycle Network, whilst improving the choice of housing in Seaton Burn. As such, the site should be removed from the Green Belt in order to bring forward a suitable housing site. | | | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152130 | Paragraph 3.2- it is notable that the vision and objectives of the Council Plan, Our North Tyneside- 2014 to 2018, as set out here, make no overt reference to the historic environment. | | Vision and Objectives | Comments noted. The Council Plan priorities have been set and adopted by the Council. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152130 | Paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 - It is disappointing to observe that other than the creation of 'a high quality environment', there is nothing in the Vision for 2032 to suggest that the well-being of the historic environment could, or should, play an important role in the renaissance of the Borough. | | Vision and Objectives | Comments noted. Section 3.4 outlines the key objectives for North Tyneside which stem from the vision. Objective 10- Protect and enhance the built and historic environment states "The Borough has a diverse and unique historic environment, with a wealth of both designated and non designated heritage assets. North Tyneside will conserve and enhance these special features. for present and future | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | generations. The more recent urban development of the Borough will be conserved and where necessary enhanced to continue to provide pleasant and attractive communities in which to live." | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152130 | Nevertheless, I welcome the inclusion of Objective 10 which deals in large measure with the conservation of the historic environment. That said, I would suggest the use of the word 'conserve' instead of 'preserve'. The latter implies a reluctance to countenance change, whereas the former allows for carefully managed change and adaptation to heritage assets to aid the social and economic regeneration of the area. The word 'conserve' also allows for preservation where necessary and appropriate. | | Vision and Objectives | Comments noted. Section will be amended. | Objective 10 now reads "conserve" instead of "preserve". |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152130 | I also welcome a number of other Objectives focusing on issues which would/could additionally address heritage conservation matters through their achievement. In particular I would observe the following- Objective 1 - the sequentially preferential prudent use of existing built fabric can do much to minimise energy and resource consumption. Objective 2- a programme of heritage conservation can help to broaden the skills base of the area's workforce and provide valuable employment opportunities in addition to those in the tourism and cultural sector. This should be recognised in Policy DM5.7 and seen as a high priority for improving skills and education in the Borough. Objective 6- making best use of the Borough's heritage assets can make a positive contribution to the regeneration of the coast, | | Vision and Objectives | Comments noted. The positive and wide-reaching impacts of heritage assets are recognised and reflected throughout the Plan. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | whilst simultaneously safeguarding it along with the natural environment. Objective 7 - I welcome reference to the Fish Quay as a catalyst for the regeneration of the riverside, but other heritage assets have similar potential, especially the World Heritage Site. Objective 8 - as with Objective 1, the sequentially preferential prudent use of existing built fabric can do much to minimise waste generation and reduce pressure on landfill sites. Objective 11 - appropriate maintenance of the transport infrastructure of the Borough (some of which is of historic value) would additionally assist with the conservation of a number of heritage assets. Objective 12 -the heritage of the area helps to convey a positive image of the Borough. | | | | |
| 396449 | Cyclists Touring Club | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015580 | 11. We welcome the objective of "making walking and cycling an attractive and safe choice for all", as well as the proposals for increased provision and priority for cyclists and pedestrians in other sections of the Plan. | | Vision and Objectives 3 | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151092 | Green Party Addendum Sustainable Development The Green Party subscribes to the concept of sustainable development as advocated by the Brundtland Commission, endorsed by the United Nations and the UK Government. Sustainable Development provides the framework within which proposed changes to the environment should be assessed. Economic and social growth have to be balanced with the imperative to preserve and enhance the natural environment. We therefore take exception to the interpretation of Sustainable Development imposed by the National | | Vision and Objectives 3 | Comment noted. The Council supports sustainable development and sets out in its objectives to ensure a sustainable future for North Tyneside with communities and infrastructure that are well placed to mitigate climate change. Each Policy in the Local Plan has been subject to consideration in the sustainability appraisal, which tests the sustainability objectives (including health and open space) against the policies and objectives. The Local Plan is prepared in cooperation with its neighbouring authorities and the shared goal to deliver sustainable development as outlined in the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Planning and Policy Framework which obliges economic and housing development to be market led and as we will see makes balancing the 3 dimensions in favour of sustainability problematic. The Local Plan offers the opportunity to recommit to Sustainable Development and the universality of the Brundtland Report. Therefore we would prefer this definition of sustainable development: 'Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs', 'Living within environmental limits', 'Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society', 'Achieving a sustainable economy', 'Promoting good governance', 'Using sound science responsibly. Climate change and finite resources of the planet Climate change is already having its impact upon food production and hence food prices here.. Nature recognises no national or indeed local sovereignty. We commend the Local Authority's Climate Change and Carbon Reduction initiatives. However we urge in the face of such considerable uncertainty that food, water and the other essentials to life should be sovereign and restored to democratic control. As things are and increasingly, they are subject to those who can afford them. Where the finite resources of the planet are concerned we know that perpetual economic growth is unsustainable. This doesn't mean that no economic development is possible. Who can deny the need and right of people seen and unseen to sufficiency and to wellbeing? But we wonder</p> | | | <p>National Planning Policy Framework. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and ecological networks, e.g. Policy AS7.4 (now AS4.4), S8.1 (now 5.1), DM8.2 (now 5.2), DM8.4 (now 5.4) and DM8.5 (now 5.5).</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>whether current population growth and movement driven by forms of economic development and encouraged by market driven priorities aren't now making that right problematic. Growth options We therefore question the growth proposals upon which this Plan is based especially given that residents when consulted chose the lower growth options. Has sufficient weighting been given to local people's expressed desire for open space and all that it offers to their sense of wellbeing and to their health in particular? Whilst acknowledging the need for housing, the nettle must be grasped and recognition given that there must be finite limits to population growth in North Tyneside. Bio-regionalism This Borough appears to us unable to provide for itself in essentials such as food. The production of a Local Plan has a Duty to Co-operate with neighbouring authorities. It would be interesting to know whether discussions have considered bio-regionalism as a means of addressing scarcity particularly in regard to life's essentials such as food, land, water, shelter, energy etc. all of which are threatened by climate change and require to be carefully stewarded. We are seriously concerned that the huge uncertainties that accompany climate change particularly in regard to life's essentials as identified above demand the greatest of attention. This requires an appreciation that they are all interconnected and sustainable. They are also a matter of self sufficiency and their security a matter for local democratic control, regulation and subsidiary. We trust</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | therefore that the Local Authority will make good its commitment to support Neighbourhood Plans, Localism and reconsider adopting the provisions of the Sustainable Communities Act. | | | | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151764 | - The Plan should clearly show how NTC might work with prospective development partners to achieve regeneration: mentioning use of Compulsory Purchase powers and 'back to back' deals for example to help bring forward schemes which help realise the Plan. - | | Vision and Objectives 3 | Comments noted. References to such approaches are included within the Implementation section of the Local Plan. | No amendments proposed. |
| 806149 | New River Retail | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151876 | Our client fully supports the identified regeneration and investment strategy set out in the local plan with particular reference to the proposals for North Shields. The Plan identifies 15 key objectives which include: i, Objective 5 Revitalise the Town Centres; ii, Objective 6 Regenerate the Coast; and iii, Objective 7 Regenerate the Riverside. We therefore support the vision, subject to the point of objection identified, and trust that the Council will take these comments into consideration, in progressing the plan. We would be grateful if we could be kept updated on progress. | | Vision and Objectives 3 | Comment noted. Further comments received are covered in other sections of the Plan | No amendments proposed. |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015128 | I think your view of the political situation is wildly over optimistic. This is a political decision that will affect a great many people. I would of guess you won't be the Mayor after the next election!! | | A Picture Of North Tyneside 2 | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898182 | | RESIDENT | LP2015718 | The level in employment growth and level of housing growth suggests that everyone taking up employment in the Borough will be living in the Borough this may not be the case. I know people who travel from Gateshead, Newcastle, co. Durham and Northumberland. | | A Picture Of North Tyneside 2 | Comment noted. The growth projections for the Borough have considered the movement of people living and/or working within North Tyneside and/or the surrounding area. The Plan aims to provide for employment land that allows for | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | increased employment opportunities in the Borough as there are currently fewer opportunities in North Tyneside than there are residents in work. | |
| 898981 | | | LP20151114 | <p>I am yet to see a government created document which does not make the a priori assumption that "growth is good" and will happen regardless. There are two obvious flaws in this assumption Firstly the idea seems to be that growth is exogenous (i.e. entirely outside of the decisions of the council). Statements that the population of North Tyneside will rise by X by 2032 makes the decisions of the council a passive spectator to this, when the opposite is true. The population of the borough will only rise if the council decides to create additional housing stock, otherwise it will not. This can easily be seen in places where development is severely limited - often places which are known for their standard of living. An excellent example would be Mallorca vs. Menorca. Mallorca has effectively had an open season on development - as a result, large parts of the island are concreted over and have lost all identity and are known for cheap holidays. On the other hand, Menorca had a moratorium on development and is now known for eco-tourism and the beauty of its national environment. Secondly, it seems to ignore the fact that the borough is a limited size and thus has limited resources. Increasing the population of the borough (growth) by definition either uses some of those resources (green belt land) or reduces the quality of them for existing residents (making transport</p> | | A Picture Of North Tyneside 2 | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside places a requirement on the authority to plan for growth due to the guidance from national government guidance (NPPF). Without an up to date Local Plan future development within the Borough will happen on an ad hoc basis and the reality of recent planning appeals at places such as Scaffold Hill near Holystone, Whitehouse Farm, near West Moor and Station Road at Wallsend have all reinforced the need for the Council to bring forward additional sites to meet the levels of growth being forecast. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM8.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' (now DM5.2) and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Policy AS7.4 (now S4.4) does reflect the importance green corridors within Murton and Killingworth Moor which are the two principal housing sites within the Borough - 'major new areas of open</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | infrastructure over-stretched for example). It would be nice to see a plan which examines how to be improve the quality of life of the residents of the borough, rather than one which attempts to increase the quantity of people in it. | | | space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identify, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside, and biodiversity.' | |
| 898630 | | | LP20151267 | 2.9. I strongly disagree with the projections here. The population in North Tyneside in 1981 was 198,700, so there has been a very low increase in population (by your measure 2300 people in 34 years). The lowest population figure of 190,500 was in 1997, and the increase between then and now is 10,700. The ONS projects an increase of nearly DOUBLE this figure over a slightly longer period of time, which is optimistic given the previous trends. And they use the term "'if current trends continue' so these projections are not a given as has been quoted back to me. The say 21,000 new people, yet, you are planning for 23,000? Far from using the middling ground I think these figures are overly optimistic and I don't think you should be planning on an "'if current trends continue' scenario. You make no mention of sensitivity analysis in these figures which would help you to monitor progress and to prioritise development. The worst effects of the recession were over by 2011, your statement implies that there has been a recession up to the present day, suggesting that we need to plan for even more growth. I find this statement a little misleading. In addition, what is the demographic of the 23,000 people you expect to live in the borough? This will significantly affect the type | | A Picture Of North Tyneside 2 | Population and household forecasts for North Tyneside are informed by a range of evidence and are part of a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. Not making adequate provision for new homes within North Tyneside will simply make it harder for residents to find quality homes to live in which they can afford. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>of housing required. For example, the population of the over 65s increased by 14% between 1981 and 2010, and the family population " those from 0 to 49 - has decreased by 9.5% over the same period. This means that different housing stock is required to the 2, 3, 4 bedroom " executive' houses currently being built. In addition to this point, older people live in their large houses because they want to be near their friends of 30,40,50 years. If appropriate housing was built for them, that would free up larger housing stock, without the need to build on precious green fields. It would be useful to know who decided what " "The preferred growth scenario" ' is. I find this a lot in the public sector where a statement is made as if it is a fact and is official, like this one, but it is actually just an opinion of an individual or small group. . '2.17 -...average weekly pay for residents of North Tyneside in 2014 Â£16 per week lower than the North East average and Â£59 per week below the average for Great Britain' If average wages are lower than the national and local average, then it will be very hard for people to buy the new houses being built. Please also see my comment about how much more expensive it is to use the metro than the London tube. '2.18 Overall, the Borough has good transport links that contribute to its suitability as a location for new housing and economic activity.' I don't agree with this statement. The metro has not been expanded since 2002 and it is very expensive. I expect the current poor service to improve after all of the work but the worse its</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>service, the more people will move to cars. It is cheaper to travel on the tube in London than on the metro and their GDP per head is significantly greater than ours. The north south public transport links are poor and reliant on congested roads. Provision for cyclists is poor - it's dangerous or convoluted to use your bicycle here. The 'A191 corridor' and the traffic to it from Killingworth - along Great Lime Road down through Forest Hall and Benton, and from it into Wallsend down Station Road is already congested. It is my understanding from talking to council officials that bus services will come when the housing is built, but this will be too late - people will get used to using their cars. The roads cannot cope as it is. I hope the proposed improvements along the A191 help, but I cannot see how they will support the two thousand plus 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses already planned, and the new houses already being built; never mind the new housing you propose for the remaining green fields around Whitley Road, which would add another 650-700 houses to the mix. Over 4000 houses, probably a lot of them with two cars. How can the infrastructure cope with this? "</p> <p>2.19 North Tyneside has the highest level of car ownership in Tyne and Wear' If we already have the highest car ownership in Tyne and Wear, the proposed housing, not served well by public transport or the metro being sold to people with 2,3 cars. It will only make getting around the borough by car even harder, and this will have a long term economic impact on the borough's economy. Road congestion cost</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the UK economy Â£13bn in 2013 according to the CEPD. I think you may also want to reflect on why the borough has the largest car ownership in Tyne and Wear, is this a result of the public transport provision in the borough or the building of houses without putting in the infrastructure to cope with them? It can't be because we are all rich because our average wage is lower than the Tyne and Wear average. ""2.20 Of the residents in employment, half work within the Borough and half outside. A substantial number of residents of adjacent areas commute into the Borough to work, but there is also a significant commuting outflow. The main origins of the 25,000 in-commuters are Newcastle, South East Northumberland and Gateshead. North Tyneside is the second largest destination for workers commuting out of Newcastle. 83% of these inward commuters travel by car and 14% by public transport.' The last sentence is quite a damning statistic. I don't blame the council for this, but I think, along with the point about car ownership, shows where investment/support is needed. It would be useful to know the breakdown of the 25,000 inward commuters. If a significant number come from South East Northumberland then this would strengthen the argument for better metro connections to perhaps Blyth, and the improvement and reopening of commuter rail/metro services from Cramlington, Killingworth and Forest Hall than could possibly link into the metro.</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151822 | We welcome the addition to the environmental picture of North Tyneside to include reference to the importance of the water environment. | | A Picture Of North Tyneside 2 | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151893 | We remain concerned about this plan and its likely impact on biodiversity. We see no real evidence of planning positively for biodiversity, no coherent ecological networks nor achieving an overall net gain in biodiversity. What we see is a plan based on an overly ambitious growth rate to compete with neighbouring authorities for tax revenues, a large amount of development on green land and lines hastily drawn on a map at the last minute to indicate wildlife corridors. As it stands we do not consider that the growth planned for North Tyneside is fully sustainable for people and wildlife. | | A Picture Of North Tyneside 2 | Comment noted. The Local Plan recognises that wildlife corridors are an important part of the green infrastructure network in the Borough and have been drawn up in cooperation with biodiversity officers from Newcastle and North Tyneside. The Local Plan will seek to conserve, enhance and manage a borough wide network of wildlife corridors within and adjoining the Borough. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM8.2 (now DM5.2) 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Policy AS7.4 (now S4.4) does reflect the importance green corridors within Murton and Killingworth Moor - 'major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identify, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside, and biodiversity.' | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152128 | Whilst necessarily only a brief snapshot of the Borough, paragraph 2.4 could nevertheless benefit from at least a passing reference to the broad range and number of other asset types it possesses, and the issues that arise from the general condition of, and pressures faced by, the historic environment of the area. | | A Picture Of North Tyneside 2 | Comments noted. The section will be amended. | Para 2.4 now reads "North Tyneside has many heritage assets, including locally registered buildings, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and conservation areas. Hadrian's Wall at Wallsend is part of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage site at Wallsend and is of international importance. These precious assets require careful management to ensure they are conserved and maintained so they can be appreciated now and in the future." |
| 463028 | | | LP201579 | Don't kid yourselves: no development is "sustainable". Stop talking rubbish! | | A Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside 4 | Comment noted. Sustainable development is outlined in the Governments National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as 'meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.'(page 2). The NPPF outlines that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890396 | | RESIDENT | LP2015133 | The loss of much of the open spaces between the various local communities in North Tyneside means that all of them now merge into one massive town. Please leave more | | A Sustainable Development Strategy for North | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | open spaces once they are gone, they are gone forever for our grandchildren. | | Tyneside 4 | | |
| 889975 | Northumberland & Newcastle Society | | LP2015871 | The Northumberland and Newcastle Society wish to register their objection to the North Tyneside Local Plan on the grounds of over development, loss of open space, creation of urban sprawl and the potential overwhelming of the existing road network and infrastructure. The Council's apparent appeasement to developers by releasing large areas of green field land throughout the borough will result in the merging of local communities and consequential loss of identity. The forecasted economic growth is debatable as is the proposed increase in population figures. North Tyneside has already seen a rapid and huge increase in housing developments and the Society objects to the loss of such large swathes within such a comparably short time frame. Smaller infill developments retaining green buffer zones would at least allow communities access to some urban open spaces. We urge North Tyneside Council to reconsider the plans and considerably reduce the proposed number of new houses. | | A Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside 4 | Comment noted. The Local Plan will seek to conserve, enhance and manage a borough wide network of wildlife corridors within and adjoining the Borough. However, the Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM8.2 (now DM5.2) 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Policy AS7.4 (now AS4.4) does reflect the importance green corridors within Murton and Killingworth Moor which are the two principal housing sites within the Borough - 'major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identify, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside, and biodiversity.' The Plan has to be deliverable and evidence will need to show that the existing or proposed level of infrastructure | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | required will be capable to accommodate the levels of growth outlined is critical. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 898831 | | RESIDENT | LP2015939 | What jobs are expected that warrant these new homes? We know of people who have moved away from N. Tyneside to Northumberland County Council Areas, despite still working in Newcastle. They quote:- more house for your money, less council tax, easy access to A189, A19 and A1 and therefore longer but quicker journeys to and from work, with the added benefit of lots of "green" space still available. All of which is being lost in the Forest Hall/ Benton areas. | | A Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside 4 | The numbers of jobs are based on the work of specialist economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside (2015). This analyses many contributing factors but draws upon the economic forecasts from the North East Local Economic Partnership. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898848 | | RESIDENT | LP2015955 | With Northumberland on our Doorstep, why do we need to ruin North Tyneside with over development. Start thinking of the locals who have to live with your (Council) decisions. No one in their right minds wants to live in an area of wall to wall housing and industrial estates. Quality of life is more important. Listen to the people, out Waggonways are great but if all they do is run between housing estates, which is happening, then they lose their recreational purpose and appeal. | | A Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside 4 | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. The Waggonways in North Tyneside are a fantastic asset for the Borough. The Local Plan supports the protection, enhancement and extension of such routes. | |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015660 | Paragraph 4.58 Positively Prepared - yes Justified- yes Effective - yes Consistency to NPPF - yes Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - yes The Coal Authority supports reference to the NPPF in relation to the Green Belt and how that national policy sets out appropriate uses that are acceptable within the Green Belt. The NPPF allows for mineral extraction to come forward in Green Belts in appropriate circumstances (paragraph 90). | | Green Belt, Safeguarded Land and Killingworth Break | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898630 | | | LP20151269 | "~4.8, 4.9, and 4.10 I disagree that the plan supports these points I have already explained my concerns about your population projections so I won't repeat them here. It is my understanding that the land proposed for housing and industrial use around Whitley Road (sites 17, 111, 139, and 110), is not for sale and that it has been surveyed and deemed unsuitable for housing due to mine workings and the risk of flooding, so you should not be trying to allocate that land for those purposes, unless there is a plan to compulsory purchase them which, as I understand it, would give you permitted development rights. Building on these last remaining greenfield sites in Benton and Wallsend does not minimise impact on the road network, and, because they will most likely be big housing estates, they will not | | Green Belt, Safeguarded Land and Killingworth Break | Sites 17, 111 and 139 are identified as suggested locations for new housing development with Site 11 now Site E010 being identified for employment uses. Even following allocation, a planning application(s) for these sites will require approval before any development can commence. Such an application will be judged on merit through the development management process. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues such as flooding and constraints due to mine workings and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site and, as an example the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>support regeneration or support local services "" why repeat the mistakes of the past? Development on these sites will not bring particular benefits to the regeneration of the area, it will erode what's left of an attractive place to live and visit. Building on these fields does not retain significant green structure, it will erode it and residents will feel boxed in with limited recreation such as walking and cycling in fresh air and semi rural setting, and the biodiversity will be more or less wiped out. Please confirm whether the land in sites (17,111, 139, and 110) is available and suitable for development or not, because I have heard that on both counts that it is not. In addition, you have added sites 111 and 139 since the last , yet sites 16, 18, 83, the land opposite Station Road near Darsley Park, a site at Palmersville, and four in Killingworth now have planning permission or are already built. I think this area has had enough development. Please designate the last remaining green field sites in Benton/Wallsend (17,111, 139, and 110) as Safeguarded land to retain a visual break between the communities of Benton/Forest Hall, Palmersville, and Wallsend. This would retain at least some element of their separate identities, support and enhance wildlife corridors, not contribute to traffic congestion, and be a relatively tranquil place for the surrounding residents to enjoy, thus retaining North Tyneside's status as an attractive place to live and visit.</p> | | | <p>Council is working closely with the Coal Authority and the Environment Agency, both through the development management and Local Plan processes. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Sites 17, 111 and 139 are assessed through the SHLAA and from this the most suitable and sustainable housing sites have been selected as potential housing allocations through the Local Plan process. Through this assessment it is has been determined that these are suitable and available for residential development, being deliverable and developable within the plan period. However planning permission will still be required before development could be progressed.</p> <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> | |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151302 | <p>4.62 Safeguarded Land We welcome the identification of safeguarded land as developable sites which "may meet longer term development needs beyond the plan period to 2032" . However, it should be noted in accordance with NPPFF (85) that Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land may be granted following a Local Plan review. Monitoring of the Local Plan will be key to ensuring that the allocated sites are sufficient and actually deliverable to meet the needs of</p> | | Green Belt, Safeguarded Land and Killingworth Break | <p>The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. However, it is acknowledged that this position needs to be reviewed throughout the plan period through appropriate monitoring indicators, any future amendment to the Green Belt or</p> | <p>Para added: "In line with national policy, any future amendments to the Green Belt and safeguarded land will be undertaken through review of the Local Plan."</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | the area, if not then this would trigger a full or partial local plan review before the end of the plan period. (4.63) Land outside of both the urban area and the Green Belt is proposed to be identified as safeguarded land. In light of our comments to (4.54) it is requested that these sites are reassessed and brought forward as developable sites within the plan period. Specific reference in this regard is made to Site 4 SHLAA ref 333 for the reasons set out in S7.3. | | | safeguarded land would have to be made through a review of the Local Plan. | |
| 396238 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20152096 | Land to the North and West of Nixon's Kitchen lying between the A 1 and A 19 and adjacent to the Holiday Inn roundabout is in the Green Belt but has been a source of nuisance and misuse for many years which has had to be dealt with by the Police and the Council. Ward Councillors were approached by the owner of the land with change of use proposal to use it for small industrial and manufacturing units. We understand that an outline business proposal has already been sent to the Council and we ourselves were given a plan. Without prejudice we have raised this informally with local people. Not only do those we have asked support this proposal from the point of view of local jobs but also feel it would put an end to the illegal use which they have had to put up with for many years. It is recognised that this is Green Belt land but having studied the Northumberland Local Plan where that Council is considering adding to their Green Belt land, could consideration be given to a reciprocal exchange approach to the Green Belt? It has been suggested by the Council | | Green Belt, Safeguarded Land and Killingworth Break | Any change to the existing Green Belt, either addition and deletion, must be proposed through the Local Plan process. In line with NPPF, in order to make such a change exceptional circumstances must be identified. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. The Council is working with both Newcastle City Council and Northumberland County Council as part of the Duty to Cooperate arrangements in order to ensure that there is a coherent sub-regional approach to strategic issues. This includes the role of adjacent areas of Green Belt and both the amount and location of new housing development. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | that there is already enough land being proposed for Industrial use and this could have an impact on Indigo Park. We are led to believe the proposed Business Plan submitted by the site owner would provide for a different type of use with smaller units so would not be in conflict with other sites. In Newcastle's local Plan there are proposals for 400 houses to be built next to Brunswick Village (and we believe from local knowledge that movement is already in hand to start this development sooner than anticipated), a further 100 on Coach Lane in Hazlerigg and more recently a proposal for an extension to the Great Park of 5,000 houses. In the Northumberland Plan there are proposals for a further 3,000 houses immediately to the North of Seaton Burn. This will increase the demand for more job opportunities near to where these houses are to be built. I have also seen letters of support from the two existing successful business units next to where this land is situated. Without prejudice ward Councillors support this change of use. | | | | |
| 798761 | | RESIDENT | LP20152196 | Only use present agricultural land as a last resort. Please keep field around Earsdon for agriculture. Thank you. | | Green Belt, Safeguarded Land and Killingworth Break | Comments noted. Guidance from the NPPF states that the best and most versatile agricultural land should be protected. The 2011 SEA scoping report shows the agricultural grades within North Tyneside. Agricultural land is categorised into grades 1-5, with grades 1,2 and 3a considered the best and most versatile. Whilst the map reveals that North Tyneside does not contain any agricultural land of significant value areas should be protected in light of their GI value, recognising how | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | development can help improve the quality of existing GI assets. There is significant scope to integrate multifunctional GI in a way which is complementary and beneficial for development. | |
| 804904 | | | LP2015253 | Please provide detail on how the council arrives at the decision of what land within the borough is considered green belt versus the 'synthetic' green field' ? Is this decided with input from the environmentalist groups, or is it just based on the current councillors residence. | | Spatial Strategy | Green Belt is a recognised national designation in national planning guidance whereas green field land is a description of the land that carries less influence in determining planning decisions unless there are other designations that cover the land e.g. site of wildlife importance. The extent of the Green Belt across North Tyneside is already established within the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). When the Green Belt was last confirmed in the UDP in 2002, it identified areas as 'safeguarded land' for the primary reason that these areas could be considered as long term development options as part of any future review of that plan. As a result, we are now considering safeguarded land as a suggested option. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to require amendments to the existing extent of North Tyneside's Green Belt. Having considered the extent of development required to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough (some of which is classed as green field), there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current plan period without requiring review of the Green Belt. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 895070 | | RESIDENT | LP2015478 | <p>We wish to object in the most strongest possible terms to the above (North Tyneside Local Plan 2015), whilst I appreciate the need to have such a plan reference both industrial and housing developments, we cannot accept there is a need to destroy a large proportion of green belt putting both the welfare of existing homeowners at risk along with the very negative provision for wildlife corridors, they are totally inadequate. There are more opportunities to utilize more brown field sites in the borough and masses along the River Tyne corridor and these development opportunities should be considered first and foremost. I bet the vast majority of the green belt will be owned by the Duke of Northumberland who is quite happy to develop sites well away from his backyard and no doubt wealth and privilege are the overriding factors here who gets what. The road extended networks are unsafe and not necessary and there are more opportunities to develop adjacent to seaton burn if it really is required to develop green belt, which we do not accept. Look at the monstrosity along the A1 where Sage has developed its an eyesore endorsed by two JAGS PRESCOTT. To conclude yes use brownfield but a massive NO to greenbelt.</p> | | Spatial Strategy | <p>Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. There are sites at the Riverside but these are considered important for future employment opportunities. The Council has therefore had to suggest Greenfield sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the image of the Borough. The last Local Plan for North Tyneside, the Unitary Development Plan (2002), identified areas as 'safeguarded land' for the primary reason that these areas could be considered as long term development options as part of any future review of that Plan. As a result, we are now considering safeguarded land as a suggested option. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to require amendments to the existing extent of North Tyneside's Green Belt. Having considered the extent of development required to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough (some of which is classed as green field), there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current plan period without</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | requiring a further review of the Green Belt. Wildlife interests and accessibility to green space are considered in Policy S5.1, DM5.2, DM5.4 and DM5.5. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. Further detailed traffic modelling work will also be carried out when the development sites are submitted for application. | |
| 897221 | | RESIDENT | LP2015591 | Future growth and development are inevitable over the next 15 years and the quality of the environment becomes increasingly important. It is clear the local plan incorporates green spaces in relation to flood management and wildlife; however it is vital, in an increasingly developed area with a growing population, to maintain free and available access to open spaces for residents. This may require adding safe crossing points and additional off road networks to link together remaining green areas. A successful existing example would be the Shiremoor bypass, which incorporated multiple use tracks in its development. | | Spatial Strategy | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898335 | | | LP2015752 | This plan is just madness! We need a plan but a proper plan. Why not spread the housing across Borough? What impact on house prices, roads and flooding in Monkseaton? This is | | Spatial Strategy | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | Labour ignoring coast people and imposing their own plans regardless of opposition. Farce. Vote them out. | | | <p>applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest Greenfield sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the image of the Borough. The last Local Plan for North Tyneside, the Unitary Development Plan (2002), identified areas as 'safeguarded land' for the primary reason that these areas could be considered as long term development options as part of any future review of that Plan. As a result, we are now considering safeguarded land as a suggested option. Having considered the extent of development required to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough (some of which is classed as green field), there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current plan period. The traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. Further detailed traffic modelling work will also be carried out when detailed site layouts can be considered within a planning application. The impact on house prices is not a planning consideration but the Plan does set out policies for flooding in Policy DM8.12 (now DM5.12) states 'All major</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | developments will be required to demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of the development proposed, and that options have been taken to reduce overall flood risk from all sources, taking into account the impact of climate change over its lifetime. All new development should contribute positively to actively reducing flood risk in line with national policy, through avoidance, reduction, management and mitigation'. | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152123 | <p>Thank you for your communication of 9 February 2015 inviting English Heritage to comment on the above document. We are pleased to do so. Our representations should be read in conjunction with our previous responses to your earlier consultation exercises, particularly that dated 15 January 2013. In our most recent response we drew particular attention to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) with regard to plan-making and the historic environment, and the need for Local Plans to enable the delivery of sustainable development, one of the core dimensions of which being the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 7). By way of reminder, I would repeat that in order to satisfy the NPPF, development plans are required, in summary, to - 1. identify the historic environment as a strategic priority (paragraph 156), 2. contain a policy or policies for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment that is/are clearly identified as strategic (paragraph 156), 3. contain a positive strategy for the</p> | | Spatial Strategy | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of the historic environment (paragraph 126), 4. demonstrate that they have been informed by a proper assessment of the significance of the heritage assets in the area, and the contribution they make to their environment, and of the potential for finding new sites of archaeological or historic interest (paragraph 163), 5. identify where development would be inappropriate because of its historic significance (paragraph 157). Our previous response provided reasoned commentary on each of these requirements and an assessment of the Plan in respect of them. I do not intend to fully repeat this commentary, but instead propose to set out below an updated assessment of the extent to which the current Plan satisfies the NPPF criteria. In addition, in an attached ANNEX A, I include specific comments and observations on the text of the document which I hope you will find helpful and constructive. 1. The historic environment as a strategic priority English Heritage is satisfied that taken as a whole the Plan satisfies that part of NPPF paragraph 156 which requires Local Plans to identify the historic environment as a strategic priority. 2. Strategic policy for the historic environment English Heritage is satisfied that the Plan contains policies for the historic environment that are clearly identified as strategic, thereby satisfying that part of paragraph 156 of the NPPF. 3. A positive strategy for the historic environment Taking the Plan as a whole, English Heritage is satisfied that it contains a number of positive</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | commitments that amount to a positive strategy for the historic environment, thereby broadly satisfying paragraph 126 of the NPPF. Annex A below, however, identifies a number of areas where the Plan somewhat undersells itself in this regard and could usefully be strengthened. Paragraph 4.10- potential development sites should be subject additionally to an assessment of the significance of any heritage assets on or otherwise affected by them, an assessment of the extent to which their significance might be harmed or lost as a consequence of development and evidence that the local authority has questioned whether the harm or loss is justified in relation to necessary public benefits that cannot be met in any other way. This exercise is also fundamental to ensuring that development is sustainable. | | | | |
| 898630 | | | LP2015902 | I'm sorry, I didn't understand a word of this. Please explain acronyms before using them. For example what is an SPD? | | Supporting Neighbourhood Plans | SPD is explained earlier in the Local Plan. However, we will include a glossary to provide clarity. | Glossary included within Local Plan document. |
| 396449 | Cyclists Touring Club | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015583 | 8.33. The first sentence would read better as: ... and access to National Cycle Network Route 72, Hadrian's Cycleway (or NCN 72, Hadrian's Cycleway). 8.34 & 8.35. Change bicycle and bike to cycle, as cycle covers non-standard bikes i.e. trikes, tandems. | | Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area: Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. | Amendments made as suggested. |
| 879379 | | | LP201550 | As a local resident, I don't want to see anymore green areas being developed as these are a vital to maintaining an attractive and natural areas for not only drawing tourists but also for use of is local residents. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest the most sustainable Greenfield sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. | |
| 890843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015165 | The steady loss of the land around the Rising Sun area is not good and the area around Murton should become protected. The line of green from North Shields to Shiremoor needs to be maintained. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as those around the Rising Sun), but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM8.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' (now Policy DM5.2) and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Policy AS7.4 (now Policy AS4.4) does reflect the importance green corridors within Murton and Killingworth Moor - 'major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identify, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside, and biodiversity.' | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 890857 | | RESIDENT | LP2015171 | At present I face a plot of agricultural land that creates a space between Dudley and Annitsford, this plan means they will merge in to one!! | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890925 | | RESIDENT | LP2015185 | Having lived on Marden for 50 years, I have seen the number of open spaces and fields in the surrounding area gradually disappearing. I use Rake Lane daily and it does not support the level of traffic as it is - the plans for housing in Murton as proposed will greatly add to this problem. Hardly any green space left - very sad! | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections over the next 15 years places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Policy AS7.4 (now Policy S4.4) does reflect the importance green spaces to be considered within any future development at Murton 'major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identify, maintaining | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | amenity space, access to the countryside, and biodiversity.' | |
| 890959 | | | LP2015188 | The Plan aims to promote the regeneration of the borough's town centres such as Whitley Bay, Wallsend and North Shields, which is a worthwhile aim. The recent proposals concerning the expansion of the Crown Estates Silverlink out of town shopping centre are incongruent with this aim and do not seem to feature in the Local Plan. If the Council truly has the interests of town centres at heart, then it should be rejecting any expansion of out of town sites such as the Silverlink. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Local Plan supports the regeneration of the Town Centres but it also outlines the future provision of retail floorspace over the next 15 years. The Local Plan needs to accommodate 6,378(sqm net) convenience floorspace and 15,249(sqm net) comparison floorspace over the next 15 years. The recent planning approval of the Crown Estates Silverlink shopping development outlined the difficulty in accommodating large scale modern retail floorspace within the Boroughs town centres. However, the Local Plan supports the principles of town centre first for potential town centre development and Policy DM6.10 (now Policy DM3.4) advocates sites to be consider in priority order first, in-centre, edge of centre, existing out-of-centre development sites previously occupied by appropriate main town centre uses that are readily accessible to metro stations or other transport connections to the town centres and finally existing out-of-centre locations. | No amendments proposed. |
| 892229 | | RESIDENT | LP2015285 | Concern about North Tyneside being one big estate - green space disappearing. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | suggest Greenfield sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. | |
| 892786 | | RESIDENT | LP2015289 | I am not against development but wildlife corridors must be preserved between Gosforth / Killingworth / Rising Sun / Murton / Backworth. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Local Plan recognises that wildlife corridors are an important part of the green infrastructure network in the Borough. The Local Plan will seek to conserve, enhance and manage a borough wide network of wildlife corridors within and adjoining the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 892874 | | RESIDENT | LP2015303 | I am in favour of the key proposals outlined on the front page of the summary document | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893274 | | RESIDENT | LP2015323 | Looks good on paper but what will reality reveal. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 604691 | | RESIDENT | LP2015333 | North of Wallsend (Station Rd) - We are going to lose some of the wildlife over 6, 5, 4, 3, 2 bedroom houses and a NHS walk-in centre. Next to the pit hill is a wildlife area, because when I was a boy it was a good place to walk, now there are going to be a lot of houses to stop you going in these areas as before. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest Greenfield sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Working with the Council and its partners the Local Plan will seek to provide safe convenient and accessible routes for pedestrians, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | cyclists, horse-riders and other non-motorised modes of transport, using green links where appropriate. | |
| 814591 | | | LP2015342 | You talk of the importance of town centres and community and I couldn't agree more. When all of the land in between each little village and each larger town is built on will it not just become one large urban sprawl? Which town centres will be chosen to represent the areas then? | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest Greenfield sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the image of the Borough. The last Local Plan for North Tyneside, the Unitary Development Plan (2002), identified areas as 'safeguarded land' for the primary reason that these areas could be considered as long term development options as part of any future review of that plan. As a result, we are now considering safeguarded land as a suggested option. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to require amendments to the existing extent of North Tyneside's Green Belt. Having considered the extent of development required to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough (some of which is classed as green field), there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current plan period without | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | requiring review of the Green Belt. It is important that within the two large areas of development at Murton and Killingworth Moor the needs of the existing and future residents are considered. the strategic allocations policy outlines that further comprehensive master planning will be required by the landowner/s and North Tyneside Council to ensure the provision of essential infrastructure, facilities and services are appropriately provided. It may be the case that a new local centre is required for Murton and or Killingworth Moor, alongside strengthening links to the existing centres that lie within close proximity to new development. These will issues will be considered as the Local Plan progresses. | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015496 | There is a requirement of NPPF for LPAs to (paragraph 117) identify and map components of the local ecological networks; and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust considers that there is a need for this policy to meet this requirement. Without this it is difficult to see how this policy meets the statement in paragraph 4.10 (of the Local Plan) which states that The strategy has the potential to accommodate new development whilst also maintaining the existing Green Belt, significant green infrastructure, and open areas to meet strategic objectives relating to open space, recreation, health and biodiversity. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The ecological networks have been mapped on the Policies Map and the Council are keen to work with partners such as Northumberland Wildlife Trust to identify areas for habitat restoration or creation, but this is also covered within policy DM8.5 (now Policy DM5.5) 'maximise opportunities for creation, restoration, enhancement, management and connection of natural habitats'. Although Policy S1.1 does not cover local ecological networks these are covered elsewhere chapter 8 of the Plan. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| 897295 | | RESIDENT | LP2015605 | I would like to see the Council aim for a more realistic growth rate which would reduce the amount of greenfields that will be built on and which will make the protection and enhancement of coherent ecological networks more achievable. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment with coherent ecological networks. | No amendments proposed. |
| 897599 | | RESIDENT | LP2015643 | I strongly urge North Tyneside Council to re-asses growth rates and reduce the amount of greenfield land that will be lost to development. We are lucky to live in a fantastic borough for wildlife and I wish to see the Council maintain and enhance our protected area, without further erosion of wildlife and open space. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM8.2 (now Policy DM5.2) 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Two of the largest suggested sites in the Local Plan are covered by Policy AS7.4 (now Policy S4.4) which aims to reflect the importance green corridors within potential development of Murton | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | and Killingworth Moor - 'major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identify, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside, and biodiversity.' | |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015659 | Positively Prepared - yes Justified - yes Effective - yes Consistency to NPPF - yes Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - yes As set out above, there are surface coal resources right across North Tyneside and as such any new housing or other development offers the potential for mineral sterilisation. Where there is a possibility of new development taking place over surface coal resources, it is important that consideration is given to the issue of mineral sterilisation. Both paragraphs 143 and 144 of the NPPF specifically refer to avoiding the unnecessary sterilisation of mineral resources through non-minerals development; this includes surface coal as a mineral of national importance. Furthermore, wherever practicable, they encourage the extraction of minerals/coal in advance of developments which would otherwise lead to sterilisation. In order to ensure consistency with national policy guidance, the Local Plan should therefore acknowledge that, as part of taking forward any development/redevelopment proposals within the surface coal resource area, it will be necessary for any sterilisation effects on the coal resource to be considered, as well as whether the prior extraction of the coal | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | would be appropriate. It is important therefore that the Local Plan is balanced by also addressing the issue of mineral safeguarding which it does. Any choice of spatial option and distribution strategy is predominantly a matter for local choice and The Coal Authority would not wish to indicate any particular preference. Any spatial strategy chosen for North Tyneside is likely to raise issues of mineral safeguarding. Where there is a possibility of new development taking place in areas at high risk of instability arising from mining legacy, it is important that consideration is given to the issue of land stability as required by paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and 166 of the NPPF. In order to ensure consistency with national policy guidance, the Local Plan should therefore acknowledge that, as part of taking forward any development/redevelopment proposals within the "Development High Risk" area as identified by The Coal Authority, it will be necessary for due cognisance to be given to land stability. It is important therefore that the Local Plan is balanced by also addressing the issue of unstable land which it also does. Any choice of spatial option and distribution strategy is predominantly a matter for local choice and The Coal Authority would not wish to indicate any particular preference. Any spatial strategy chosen for North Tyneside is likely to raise issues of land stability. | | | | |
| 396641 | | RESIDENT | LP2015691 | As "protect the Green Belt in North Tyneside" is the first key proposal in the Local Plan, I am concerned as I have mentioned, that areas 17 and 139 are shown as on top of the green belt | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. Both site 17 and 139 are green field sites but not designated green belt land. Wildlife corridors pass through both sites and policies S8.4, DM8.5 and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | | | | corridor. The green belt is already being eaten into in other sites with planning permission, so we must be very careful to abide that first key proposal as well as support the other key proposals. | | | DM8.6 (now Policies S5.4, DM5.5 and DM5.6) seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. | |
| 791875 | | RESIDENT | LP2015852 | Will the adjacent land to the different areas co-operate and build housing and industrial sites and vice-versa? | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | The Local Plan has suggested sites for different uses such as housing and employment. The Council has suggested these sites to meet the overall requirements of housing and employment need in the Borough and these sites have been selected based on evidence reports and previous consultation responses. There would be no requirement to develop adjacent land to suggested sites in the Local Plan. | No amendments proposed |
| 804904 | | | LP2015906 | I don't think there are enough brown areas on this map, lets fill in those blank spaces around Murton with 3000 houses. What is the NTC 30/50 year plan for the region - are we to start building houses in the north sea under the absurd field of dreams assumption that 'if we build it people will come' | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan for the next 15 years to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest Greenfield sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. | |
| 805010 | | RESIDENT | LP2015911 | I was very disappointed at the outcome of the appeal by Persimmons to build on field to East of Station Road North. I am now concerned about losing identity as Wallsend Benton Holystone Forest Hall & Palmersville will soon be merged into one if planning permission is given for any more building on green field sites in this locality. I wish to register my opposition to any more developments on green fields in my area. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan for the next 15 years to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed and the recent appeal decisions have shown the need to Plan for growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest Greenfield sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. | No amendments proposed |
| 898939 | 38 Degrees North Tyneside East | | LP2015987 | I am writing on behalf of 38 Degrees North Tyneside East, a local group that is part of a national campaigning organisation. We are local people, we are writing about the area proposed to be developed surrounding Murton and adjacent to New York, Shiremoor, Wellfield, Earsdon and Preston Grange. Whilst we accept there is a need for more social housing in North Tyneside, we would not accept that proposed site is suitable for a development as described in the plan. Indeed, the plan far exceeds earlier figures following | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan for the next 15 years to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest Greenfield sites for development | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>consultations at a previous stage of the planar€™s progress. Our objections hinge on a number of major impact areas for residents:</p> <p>1. Loss of Amenity "" a decrease in attractiveness and value of the open space to the current North Tyneside residents, particularly those living adjacent to the proposed development area. This area is much used and loved by local people.</p> <p>2. Traffic congestion - Significant worsening of traffic on already very congested roads. Additionally, the traffic management plans are either unclear or damaging, for example crossing wildlife corridors.</p> <p>3. Noise and Air Pollution "" as a result of a major increases in traffic will result</p> <p>4. Wildlife and the natural environment "" I understand the arable land at Murton Park was identified as a compensation area, being provided as a means of compensating for the loss of the Station Road development site (North Tyneside Council planning reference 12/02025/FUL Fields north of 45 Sunholme Drive, Wallsend). The original planning application for Station Road, part of which was the habitat management plan which set up Murton as the offset land. This is the wildlife and habitat management plan for Murton is a compensation area for the Station Road development. It identifies an 8 acres site at the North of Murton, including the wildlife corridor identified on the local plan as emerging from the greenbelt at Earsdon and crossing the Murton area, which is to be the designated offset land. This land is specified as "to be managed in perpetuity for wintering</p> | | | <p>but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. The Murton and Killingworth sites are suggested as strategic allocations and Policy AS7.4 (now Policy S4.4) includes a set of criteria that would need to be considered, including a comprehensive Masterplan detailing how amenity space, green infrastructure and traffic would be incorporated in any proposal. Policy DM8.16 (now DM5.19), which aims to address any potentially unacceptable problems associated with pollution (whether by noise or air quality). The Council has a Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015) and Policy S8.1 and DM8.2 (now Policies S5.1 and DM5.2) expand on the Council approach to strategic green infrastructure and the protection of green infrastructure. The development of the Murton Site would have to allow for the planning obligations attached to the planning application at Station Road for the mitigation of wintering birds.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | waders and farmland birds" (p4), further, the detailed plans identify a subset of land immediately to the North of Murton which is the designated grassland area which is to be "set aside as an area of permanent grassland". The management work at Murton Park was described as forming a key part of the ecological mitigation strategy devised for that planning application. This plan was drawn up not only for wintering wading bird species, of special importance to golden plover and lapwings, but also for farmland birds species including skylark, meadow pipit and yellowhammer and grey partridge. Can we assume the plans protect these agreements at the very least 5. Green infrastructure - has the council got a strategic plan for the green infrastructure, including the mitigated land, and how will this be maintained (and improved) amongst all the proposed development | | | | |
| 805282 | | | LP20151001 | I remain very concerned at the comment that, "most housing development will be located within the areas of ...the North West..." Despite your follow up comments those of the public to the original consultation, the area between Annitsford and Dudley (Annitsford Farm) does provide a recreational area for local residents and is also a home to wildlife. You have ignored the objections of local residents who do not wish to be swallowed up by yet more new housing. To build 400 homes on this site is ludicrous, losing valuable green space to residents and animals and increasing stress on local services and roads. There will be an inevitable effect | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council are actively seeking to engage with the public in the production of the forthcoming Local Plan and it has already been through many stages of public consultation. The views of residents have to be balanced against other factors such as national government policy and population projections. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>on existing house prices which will decrease as a result of becoming part of a larger housing estate, something that I did. not move here to be! Considering that the new Gentoo development on The Wyndings have still not sold all their 'new' homes,' it seems absolute madness to add yet more!</p> <p>Annitsford and Dudley are losing their identity and will become merged into one giant housing estate, homes being surrounded by yet more urban development. There are plenty of other sites that could be considered over this area rather than over developing one small site.</p> | | | <p>that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife and recreational interests are considered in chapter 8 of the Plan. The reality of recent planning appeals for large scale housing development within the Borough, which have been refused by the Council but overturned at appeal by an independent inspector, reflects the position of the Council having to make provision for future generations.</p> | |
| 797386 | | | LP20151041 | <p>There is no need for a great deal of new housing; static property prices show that we do not have a major lack of housing here. Some affordable housing may be needed. That can be achieved by using the brownfield sites. It would be quite wrong and unnecessary to use any of the green areas or to crowd out the coast with more housing.</p> | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | <p>Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan for the next 15 years to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest Greenfield sites for development but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough.</p> | No amendments proposed |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151299 | <p>4 A sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside (4.5) The sub-division of the plan area into "'Strategic Policy Areas' would benefit from further clarity on Map 2 and the proposals map. The extent of the "'Urban</p> | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | <p>Comment noted. Map 2 and the Strategic Policy Areas will be clarified. Further evidence on the viability work to accompany the Local Plan will be made available once it is published.</p> | Revised Map produced to show strategic policy areas |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | Fringe Area' is unclear, this requires a boundary line to make it clear where the 'Urban Fringe' is differentiated from the remaining 'Main Urban Area'. | | | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151319 | Policy S1: Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development. CPRE broadly support the spatial strategy. Reference to development of the transport (public & road) provision and networks in the Borough in relation to development location would be helpful. Paragraph 4:17, p. 26. It is important to stress here and elsewhere that riverside industrial sites should be reserved for maritime industries that require direct access to the River and in particular the deep water channel, in line with Obj 7. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. Paragraph 4.17 (now para 11.5) will be amended to reflect the opportunities for maritime industries to take advantage of the riverside frontage along the Tyne. Policy S1.1 does reference the Plans approach to support development that reduces the need to travel, which involves the coordination between new development and transport provision. This is also identified in paragraph 4.8 and therefore it is not considered necessary to make any further amendments. | Amend paragraph 4.17 to include reference to opportunities for maritime industries on the industrial sites with river access. Now paragraph 11.5 |
| 808714 | | RESIDENT | LP20151413 | I understand the requirement for a plan however - North Tyneside does not need this level of over development - North Tyneside are not able to promise homes and employment on the basis of this plan - Durham Council had a broadly similar plan which was rejected by central government, this completely reduces North Tyneside Claims that central government require it. - Development on this scale will ruin North Tyneside | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Durham decision has stressed the importance to working closely with partners and neighbouring local authorities to ensure that the objectives and growth targets in the Local Plan are deliverable. The evidence produced from independent consultants on levels of growth in North Tyneside are supported by neighbouring authorities and the reality of recent planning appeals at places such as Scaffold Hill near Holystone, Whitehouse Farm, near West Moor and Station Road at Wallsend have all reinforced the need for the Council to bring forward additional sites to meet the levels of growth forecast. Through the Local Plan the Council intends to develop a Plan led approach to future growth so the issues of new development can be considered together and therefore bringing about the best possible solutions to | Continue to work in cooperation with neighbouring authorities |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | difficult issues. | |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151426 | <p>In summary, I would like to see the Council aim for a more realistic growth rate which would reduce the amount of green field land that would be built on and which will make the protection and enhancement of coherent ecological networks more achievable. I trust that you will attach due weight to my comments and afford them and our local wildlife the consideration they deserve. Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example Site 11 now Site E010 contains a Site of Local Wildlife Interest, site 109 is located on a wildlife corridor and part of sites 35-41 is to provide ecological compensation for a development elsewhere in the borough.</p> | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as 11 & 109), but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will result in smaller site areas for some sites but provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. Site 109 along with other sites suggested for development in the Plan have wildlife corridors running through them. The precise location of development within these sites has not been determined and the policies of the Plan highlights the need for wildlife corridors to be accommodated within future development. Council officer's comment on site 109 was 'Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality wildlife corridors were not incorporated into any scheme'. The development of the sites 35-41 would have to allow for the planning obligations</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | attached to the planning application at Station Road for the mitigation of wintering birds. Policy AS7.4 (now Policy S4.4) also includes a set of criteria that would need to be considered, including a comprehensive Masterplan detailing how amenity space, green infrastructure and traffic would be incorporated in any proposal. | |
| 898767 | | | LP20151542 | I hope you will be able to take the objections below into consideration when debating the strategic plan. We understand that there are people keen to get on the housing ladder. We have children in that situation ourselves. But this is not the way. By filling every available green patch with identikit houses Benton will lose it's character and it's desirability. Worse, the infra structure will grind to a halt. We understand that people - especially young people - are desperate for work. But creating a house building bubble is not in the long term interests for them, for us or for the area of Benton, when there are far more creative ways of developing trades and skills by re-using existing housing stock and converting available buildings, not to mention developing skills in creation and management of sustainable natural habitats adjacent to semi urban areas. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899323 | | | LP20151607 | NewRiver Retail supports the Council's decision to direct most retail and leisure activities within the main town centres including Wallsend and North Shields as set out in Policy S1.1. This is in accordance with Paragraph 23 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 899297 | | | LP20151693 | There is a requirement of NPPF for LPAs to (paragraph 117) identify and map components of the local ecological networks"; and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. Northumberland Wildlife Trust considered that there is a need for this policy to meet this requirement. Without this it is difficult to see how this policy meets the statement in paragraph 4.10 (of the Local Plan) which states that "The strategy has the potential to accommodate new development whilst also maintaining the existing Green Belt, significant green infrastructure, and open areas to meet strategic objectives relating to open space, recreation, health and biodiversity€ . These comments have not been addressed. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The ecological networks have been mapped on the Policies Map and the Council are keen to work with partners such as Northumberland Wildlife Trust to identify areas for habitat restoration or creation, but this is also covered within policy DM8.5 'maximise opportunities for creation, restoration, enhancement, management and connection of natural habitats'. Although Policy S1.1 does not cover local ecological networks these are covered elsewhere within Chapter 8 of the Plan. | No amendments proposed. |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151725 | 12. Part "'b' of the policy indicates that most housing development will be located within a dispersed pattern within the Main Urban Area and within the areas of North Shields, Wallsend, the Coast and the North West where development could bring particular benefits to the regeneration of the area. The 2010 Affordable Housing Viability Assessment does, however, identify that many of these areas suffer from the greatest viability issues. It is noted that the Council is currently undertaking an Area Wide Viability Assessment which is likely to provide additional up to date information, unfortunately this report was not available at the time of writing and as such has not informed our comments. 13. To ensure that the plan is delivered, it is important that the | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council will need to ensure that the Local Plan is effective and therefore it will need to show that the sites proposed for future development will be deliverable. The Local Plan includes a wide range of sites and the viability report will be available as the Plan is developed. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | sites identified are deliverable early in the plan process and that significant burdens are not placed upon development, particularly in the more marginal areas. The Council may wish to consider reducing its reliance upon the more marginal areas by providing a wider range of sites to ensure plan deliverability. In addition the Council may wish to consider reducing the | | | | |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151793 | We recognise the varying characteristics presented by different geographical areas of the Borough, and that the Spatial Strategy has been developed in accordance with Strategic Policy Areas, whereby the Borough area has been divided accordingly. Upon reviewing Policy S1.1 "Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development', we would suggest that an additional criterion is added to both sections "a' and "b', to ensure that employment and housing developments are located in accordance with the capacity of the sewerage network. We suggest that the additional wording should read as follows: a) Employment development will be located: i. within the Main Urban Area ii. at areas easily accessible to residents by a range of sustainable means of transport iii. where businesses may benefit from the Borough's excellent national and international transport connections " including the strategic road network and opportunities provided by the River Tyne iv. where the capacities of critical infrastructure, and timescales associated with investment works, can support development proposals b) Most housing development will be located: i. in a dispersed pattern in the | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The offer of support and expertise on sustainable surface water management is welcomed and the Council will continue to seek the early involvement of Northumbria Water in development proposals. The issues relating to reducing the flood risk through reducing surface water discharge to sewers and the incorporation of sustainable surface water management design are included in section 8 The Water Environment. The emphasis of proposed criteria (a)(iv) and criteria (b)(iii) are outlined in the first sentence of the Policy and the Local Plan should be read as a whole whereby other policies such as the water environment would be applicable. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Main Urban Area; and ii. within the areas of North Shields, Wallsend, the Coast and the North West where development could bring particular benefits to the regeneration of the area iii. where the capacities of critical infrastructure, and timescales associated with investment works, can support development proposals At this point, we would like to highlight the opportunities presented by the LPCD to reduce existing sewer flooding risk in the Borough, thereby contributing towards the achievement of sustainable development. The sustainable redevelopment of brownfield sites can improve existing flood risk by reducing surface water discharge to sewers, whilst larger sites present opportunities for masterplanning and strategic drainage schemes. Removal of surface water from the sewerage network will not only serve to reduce the risk of sewer flooding in the Borough, but will also increase the headroom of Howdon STW for future foul flows. In this respect, we have attached a copy of a recent position statement on the capacity of Howdon STW for your information. This was previously provided to your planning officers. It is our opinion that the benefits of sustainable surface water management and the importance of surface water separation schemes should be highlighted throughout the LPCD, with policies striving to ensure that all new development seeks to incorporate sustainable surface water management design. Following the identification of specific sites using the guidance contained within Policy S1.1, we would recommend that</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | consultation takes place with NWL as early as possible in the development process to ensure that any required upgrades to our networks can be appropriately planned and implemented in a timely manner. Additionally, we can offer support and expertise on sustainable surface water management for development proposals coming forward in the plan period. | | | | |
| 463486 | | | LP20151845 | Murton village has been awarded a "strategic development buffer", this has been fought for by West Moor residents for years. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The details of the open space to be provided within the Murton site will be considered as part of the work on a Master Plan. West Moor currently has a site to the south of the area designated for Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan and the allocations to Site 11 now Site E010 includes recognition of the Site of Local Conservation Importance to the north of the allocation and south of Greenhaugh whilst a Wildlife Corridor also crosses the site. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900517 | | RESIDENT | LP20151852 | The need for housing should not compromise others safety and comfort. Squashing housing in is not productive or useful for anyone. Road and access should be big enough and safe for both drivers and pedestrians. Green space needed for children's play and leisure. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife and recreational interests are considered within Chapter 8 of the Plan. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. | |
| 900519 | | RESIDENT | LP20151854 | We are concerned that the proposed plan will mean losing the fields between Benton and Palmersville and Wallsend, resulting in an ever growing urban conurbation. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as 11), but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will result in smaller site areas for some sites but provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The physical constraints of overhead power lines to the northern section of site 17 means this area would be removed from the allocation of housing land, but designated as green space. | No amendments proposed to the policies map. Within the body of the Local Plan document additional indicative mapping is provided identifying potential access points and strategic open space within proposed allocations. |
| 807291 | | RESIDENT | LP20151864 | I am annoyed that more houses are being built in Killingworth. North Tyneside council is hell bent on building on more greenfields. Lots of birds nesting on these fields and wildlife. Put more houses up in the Dudley/Seaton Burn area - plenty of room. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth and a lack of available sites within | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the Dudley/Seaton Burn area to provide for the levels of growth identified in the evidence from independent experts. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM8.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' (now Policy DM5.2) and the intention of the policy is to be positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Development at Killingworth Moor is covered by Policy AS7.4 (now Policy S4.4) and criteria (d), which reflects the importance of any future development proposal providing a multifunctional green infrastructure strategy that retains, enhances, connects and increases the biodiversity of each site, retains and enhances any important hedgerows or tree belts, provides well-integrated green space (formal, natural and allotments), provides well integrated sustainable drainage systems and provides cycle and pedestrian links through the site that connect to the existing network and town centre'. | |
| 805704 | | | LP20151870 | Sustainable Communities. For the above reasons I question whether it is wise to commit land that could/is being used for growing food, to be used for housing. However if this is inevitable then I would propose that the opportunity is taken to use it to plan and design a development for the 21st. Century to provide a model for any | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>future communities in North Tyneside as well as those that exist. This pilot would explore what is meant by a sustainable community and explore design and build that is responsive to the changes in the climate. Could this village/town be truly inclusive, designed in away that optimises self sufficiency and sustainability? Could it minimise or indeed eliminate the disadvantages of people often considered vulnerable. That is to say people who are poor, disabled, elderly, woman, children, those suffering ill health and those without a private motor car. Indeed all of us at some time in our lives. It would be designed to a human scale, that is to say, in a way that would enable people to know and appreciate each other in an environment, natural as well as built, which furthers their health and sense of well being? - where children could play safely and yet have ease of access to the natural environment - where the pedestrian and those with mobility difficulties young and old are favoured. - where women in particular can be confident at any time. This would mean having ease of access to the provision of shops, services, community facilities, doctors, dentists, pubs, churches, schools, police, banks etc which if not possible to reach by foot or wheelchair have good public transport available. This suggests a local economy which would support community self sufficiency, community ownership and encourage active citizenship. It could mean locally grown food that might be provided from allotments, a market garden, community</p> | | | <p>growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to deliver sustainable development addressing the points you highlight. Overall the Local Plan sets out what a sustainable community may look like and this is probably best evidenced within Policy S1.1.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|------------------------|
| | | | | supported agriculture, orchards etc. where there is self sufficiency in energy generation provided by renewable forms of it and is efficiently used and where local waste remains a local resource. Where local enterprise is encouraged and which amongst other things, meets the real needs of local people sustainably. Where people can "grow' their own culture and value their own heritage. It would be designed, planned and built to standards and with materials that accommodating climate change requires. What is best practice? In a national and global economy in which we will continue to need to trade, how we respond competitively or co-operatively to the socially just interests and wellbeing of others unseen will affect this future. A transition to a Sustainable future?. Why the above? I asked in my previous submission that the Local Plan defines a Sustainable Community which might help explain from an ideal, the ambitions of a local plan to enable the transition to a sustainable future and why. I think as a community we owe it to ourselves and our children to be experimenting, researching, exploring what a sustainable community might look like, together. We should though, have in mind those who may have difficulty participating in the conversation and its consequences. I believe times demand it and this Local Plan may in final form offer the opportunity. | | | | |
| 900541 | | RESIDENT | LP20151872 | Concerning Benton area where we have lived for 30 years: Forest hall and Benton were green and pleasant places to live 30 years ago.. Ever since there has been a thoughtless | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The government guidance has been supportive of new housing development over recent | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | and ill considered building allowed on green field sites, houses and gardens have been destroyed to provide dense housing schemes and no thought has been given to townscape and provision of amenities. Traffic has become impossible at rush hour with no provision for improving the road system. The result is a built up area with no environmental appeal and an unattractive place to live. | | | years and this has continued with the guidance published in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. The Council has a lack of available sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but also planning for the infrastructure that would be necessary. Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | |
| 806149 | New River Retail | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151877 | We support the identification of North Shields as a focus for new retail, leisure and other main town centre uses and its improvement through a comprehensive approach to social, economic and physical regeneration, together with enhanced shopping, leisure provision, offices and homes. Furthermore the plan seeks to regenerate the Coast from North Shields Fish Quay to St Mary's Lighthouse in Whitley Bay, enhancing its image through a coordinated approach to delivering regeneration schemes with new facilities and improved public realm to develop the tourism and visitor offer whilst safeguarding the natural landscape and wildlife habitat. However, although we support the wider objectives and strategy of the Plan, we | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Local Plan does seek to revitalise its town centres (Objective 5) and supports a town centre first approach towards new development for main town centre uses in accordance with NPPF. Proposals for town centre uses that come forward outside of defined centres will need to consider the impact in accordance with Policy DM6.10 (now Policy DM3.4) that requires proposals over a certain floorspace threshold to commission an impact assessment considering the following criteria: g. the proposal would have no significant adverse impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a | Contacted the agents to request any potential amendments to the policy that could further strengthen the town centres or if they are aware of any future regeneration proposals for the town centres. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | | | | believe that it should include a specific policy mechanism for testing the effects of application proposals that come forward outside the defined North Shields regeneration areas, in order to ensure that they will not have any material adverse effects on any aspects of the regeneration strategy. Safeguarding the defined areas in this way and guiding development activity will be an important part of securing the necessary investment in the regeneration areas and we object to the Plan's lack of specific policy framework on this point, | | | centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and h. the impact of the proposal on the vitality and viability of a Town Centre, including consumer choice and trade in the Town Centre. It is through this specific policy mechanism that the Local Plan seeks to test the effects of application proposals that come forward outside of defined centres to promote a town centre first approach and encourage investment into its town centres. The Council are committed to working with respondents through the Local Plan consultation process and will seek to engage in further discussion with the respondent on this issue. | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151898 | There is a requirement of NPPF for LPAs to (paragraph 117) identify and map components of the local ecological networks and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. NHSN considers that there is a need for this policy to meet this requirement. Without this it is difficult to see how this policy meets the statement in paragraph 4.10 (of the Local Plan) which states that "The strategy has the potential to accommodate new development whilst also maintaining the existing Green Belt, significant green infrastructure, and open areas to meet strategic objectives relating to open space, recreation, health and biodiversity€ . | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The wildlife corridors have been mapped on the Policies Map and the Council are keen to work with partners such as Northumberland Wildlife Trust to identify areas for habitat restoration or creation and this is reflected in policy DM8.5 (now Policy DM5.7) 'maximise opportunities for creation, restoration, enhancement, management and connection of natural habitats'. Policies S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now Policies S5.4, DM5.5 and DM5.6) are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | circumstances exist to amend its boundary. The Local Plan also accommodates significant green infrastructure and open areas within the Borough and this is prioritised in Policy S8.1 and DM8.2 (now Policies S5.1 and DM5.2). | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151931 | The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) states there is no direct link between this policy and SA objective 13 which is "To avoid adverse effects to the areas ecological network, including designated wildlife sites and protected species, and to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity." However, Natural England disagree as the policy references the coast as one of the locations where most housing, tourist, cultural facilities and accommodation will be located. As the coast contains nationally and internationally protected nature conservation sites that may be directly or indirectly harmed by the spatial strategy this should be reassessed against reasonable strategy alternatives. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. SA to be revised for this policy, acknowledging the link between SA objective 13 on ecology and the spatial strategy of the Borough. | SA revised accordingly. |
| 830576 | Taylor Wimpey | DEVELOPER | LP20151979 | The general principle of preparing a spatial strategy on the categories of the Urban Fringe, the Main Urban Area and the Four Priority Investment Areas is generally supported. However, the accompanying plan (map 2 within the consultation document) is difficult to correlate with the above listed category. Specifically, the map includes reference to the 'Urban Region' which it is assumed comprises the 'Main Urban Area'. Similarly, it is not clear from the corresponding map exactly what areas of the borough are considered to comprise the | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. Map 2 (now Map ?) and the Strategic Policy Areas will be clarified. Further evidence on the viability work to accompany the Local Plan will be made available once it is published. | Revised Map produced to show strategic policy areas |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | 'Urban Fringe'. In order facilitate clarity in the plan, it is considered the references on the plan should be consistent with the references contained within the spatial strategy. Without such conformity, there is a risk of uncertainty in the application of subsequent policies of the plan. It is also noted that certain areas of the borough identified for growth over the plan period suffer from constraints over viability. We reserve our position to make further comments on the viability of specific areas of the plan as and when the viability assessment is published. | | | | |
| 900788 | | DEVELOPER | LP20151987 | Our client welcomes the recognition in Policy S1.1 ((b) i) and ((b) ii) that housing development should be located "in a dispersed pattern in the Main Urban Area" and "within the areas of North Shields, Wall send, the Coast and the North West where development could bring particular benefits to the regeneration of the area". It is considered that our client's site would meet these criteria due to its location within the Main Urban Area, as well as its potential to contribute to the delivery of regeneration benefits in the local area. As such, the site should be brought forward for residential development. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152002 | The consortium supports Policy S1.1 and the spatial strategy for sustainable development but would suggest an amendment to criterion b) to include specific reference to the Strategic Site Allocations at Killingworth Moor and Murton. This is because combined the two sites will deliver a significant proportion of the overall housing allocation for the | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted and the suggested amendment will be discussed to reflect the proposed growth at Murton and Killingworth. | Wording of policy S1.1 amended to incorporate reference to the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic allocations. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | Borough, are of strategic importance and should therefore be listed in the spatial strategy. We would suggest Policy S1.1 is amended as follows: b) Most housing developments will be located; i. in a dispersed pattern in the Main Urban Area; and ii. at the Strategic Allocations at Killingworth Moor and Murton iii. within the areas of North Shields, Wallsend, the coast and the North West where development could bring particular benefits to the regeneration of the area | | | | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152017 | Policy S1.1 is generally supported as this provides the most logical and sustainable spatial strategy for the North Tyneside area. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152071 | RE New Site: Russell Square. Our client supports the Spatial Strategy for delivering sustainable development in the Borough as outlined in Policy S1.1 which states that "Most housing development will be located" within the areas of North Shields, Wallsend, the Coast and the North West where development could bring particular benefits to the regeneration of the area" . Our client supports the recognition that the North West of the Borough provides a suitable and preferred location for new housing development. The development of our Client's site would therefore contribute towards the delivery of new housing in the North West and aid the achievement of the Spatial Strategy. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396238 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20152081 | from Councillor Muriel Green March 26th 2015, particularly in relation to Weetslade Ward in North West Area Summary. Cllrs Anthony McMullen and Joanne Cassidy have | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The importance of the North West and the regeneration of villages in the North West are recognised in Policy S1.1 with further detail provided in Policy | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | given verbal support to this submission. General. 1. Would like to see more recognition of need to have plans for regeneration of former mining villages, especially Dudley and Seaton Burn so that development of current empty sites will allow some structure to the village in the future and provide for current unmet need. 2. As the Northern Gateway (Sandy Lane Bypass) has been omitted from the Plan and there are proposals for further extensive house building in the area as well as the development of the Weetslade Industrial site there is a special need to consider future traffic flows and movements. Work to the south of the Sandy Lane roundabout in front of Gosforth Park is long overdue but Sandy Lane itself has been over capacity since the 70s ... | | | AS1.6, AS9.9 and AS9.10 (now Policies AS8.24, AS8.25 and AS8.26). Policies referring to the North West will be amended to "North west Villages rather than "North West Communities". Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements (including along the A1056) to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152086 | RE New Site: Land to rear Front Street, Seaton Burn. Our client welcomes the recognition in Policy S1.1 ((a) iii) that employment development should be located "where businesses may benefit from the Borough's excellent national and international transport connections - including the strategic road network" . The recognition that employment development should also be located "at areas easily accessible to residents by a range of sustainable means of transport" (as set out in (a) ii) is also supported. As set out above, it is considered that our client's site would fully meet these criteria due to its unique location adjacent to the A1/A19 junction, as well as the close proximity of bus stops and National Cycle Network. As such, the site should be removed from the Green Belt and brought | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Local Plan has consequently not sought to review or amend the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside. Having considered the extent of development requirements to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough, addressed in policies S3.3 and DM3.4 (now Policies S1.7 and DM1.8), there remains sufficient land in sustainable locations to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current plan period without requiring review of the Green Belt. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | forward as a suitable employment site. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152101 | RE New Site: Land to south of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn. Our client supports the Spatial Strategy for delivering sustainable development in the Borough as outlined in Policy S1.1 which states that "Most housing development will be located" within the areas of North Shields, Wallsend, the Coast and the North West where development could bring particular benefits to the regeneration of the area" . Our client supports the recognition that the North West of the Borough provides a suitable and preferred location for new housing development. The development of our Client's land would therefore contribute towards the delivery of new housing in the North West and aid the achievement of the Spatial Strategy. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152132 | Policy S 1.1 proposes to focus new tourist and cultural facilities and accommodation in specific locations. It should be acknowledged, however, that 'historic' facilities exist wherever found and cannot be moved or necessarily made to align comfortably with what might be regarded as locationally preferential planning areas. Some recreational activities, by their nature, are better suited to rural locations. Segedunum is so important in terms of culture, tourism and recreation that it justifies specific reference in the policy. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comments noted. We acknowledge that some established facilities and activities will be in parts of the Borough that may not correspond with this spatial strategy. The policy recognises this by the use of "most". A reference to Segedunum can be added to the policy. | Criterion dii now reads "at areas such as the Coast, riverside and main town centres of Whitley Bay, North Shields and Wallsend, including the World Heritage Site at Segedunum Roman Fort." |
| 798761 | | RESIDENT | LP20152195 | PLEASE USE BROWNFIELD sites first. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | Development | North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. The Councils intention to prioritise delivery of housing on brown field land is reflected in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1), but when allocating sites for new development there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development. | |
| 901303 | | RESIDENT | LP20152203 | North Tyneside still (only just) feels like it has some space and air to it. If all your proposals go through then it will become just another sprawl of buildings like the West end of Newcastle. Leaving some fields on the outskirts is not sufficient to maintain what MAKES North Tyneside. An alternative location if opposing a suggested site - No Idea!! It must be very difficult for you!! I do appreciate that. Key proposals to protect and enhance green areas seems to be a joke! Its going!! On the Map where is the NEW accessible open space??? Your Green Belt is literally a strip. What about lungs within North Tyneside itself The pressure to build and build is immense, I know, but please know that North Tyneside is a great borough with a wide mix of people "" and its spaces help all of breathe and be well and walk dogs and let kids play. SPACE is very important. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. The Councils intention to prioritise delivery of housing on brown field land is reflected in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1), but when allocating sites for new development there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Policy AS7.4 (now Policy AS4.4), which covers the strategic allocations at Murton and Killingworth, reflects the importance green spaces to be considered within future development 'Major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | identify, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside, and biodiversity.' | |
| 901305 | | RESIDENT | LP20152204 | Refer to Council report "" 1987 Findings still stand today! We are the last village in North Tyneside. | | S 1.1 Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development | Comment noted. Unfortunately there is not enough detail in the response to check the findings of the 1987 report. | No amendments proposed. |
| 892444 | | RESIDENT | LP2015261 | In 2007/2008 the council hired at taxpayers expense an outside consultancy agency; aimed at improving the 'North Banks' of the Tyne. Some of the plans were very exciting and aimed at attracting new 'green' and hi tech industry onto the river and improving housing and the environment. It seems little or nothing has been done. While welcoming hundreds of jobs at OGN, most of the area around Howdon remains runs down and almost derelict. | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | Comment noted. The River Tyne North Bank consultant study provides a strategic framework for regeneration and investment in the area and is the basis which the Council has worked to bring major investment into the Borough. Although take up of this land for economic development has been slow there has been lots of work carried out to attract investment to the area and large parts of the riverside are now designated as an Enterprise Zone. This provides financial incentives to encourage investment in the area and simplified planning regulations. Policy S5.5 ('River Tyne North Bank') (now S2.5) reaffirms the Councils ambitions to bring forward investment in renewable and marine off-shore manufacturing and sub sea technologies and the Enterprise Zone is designated for Low Carbon Enterprise. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396551 | | RESIDENT | LP2015317 | It seems unfortunate that no provision has been made to allow an area of public access to the North Bank of the River Tyne, for local / tourist sightseeing purposes. | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | The topography, area and limited width to the riverside presents a challenge to accessibility. The Fish Quay Neighbourhood Plan provides specific detail on the area and outlines the ambitions for a 'Promenade' (SPD). | No amendments proposed |
| 396449 | Cyclists Touring Club | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015581 | f. Hadrian's Way Cycle Path should be Hadrian's Cycleway. | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | Thank you for the correct information. | "Hadrian's Way Cycle Path" changed to "Hadrian's Cycleway" |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152114 | The map on page 26 (Map 3: Wallsend and Willington Quay sub-area) should say Scheduled Ancient Monument, not Ancient Monument. I wonder if this map should also show the World Heritage Site buffer zone? I can provide a GIS shapefile of this if you have not got it. | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | Noted, issues will be addressed in revised Maps. | Requested changes made. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151320 | Policy AS 1:2. The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub-area. CPRE can support this policy. | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899323 | | | LP20151608 | Within Wallsend, NewRiver Retail supports the commitment of the Council to "Improve the town's shopping and pedestrian environment and encourage a better mix of leisure activities and support plans for refurbishment and extension of The Forum shopping centre" as set out in Policy AS1.2. Clearly setting out this strategy in the Local Plan will facilitate investment into Wallsend town centre. The Council should be clear in stating that "a better mix" means that additional food and drink uses would be anticipated. This clarification can therefore also be read against the "leisure facilities' definition included at Paragraph 5.13 of the Plan. | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | Comment noted. The comments are helpful in highlighting that paragraph 5.13 could provide additional clarification to include restaurants and pubs. Overall the Local Plan tries to avoid repeating sections covered elsewhere in the Local Plan and should be read as one document. As such the detail on what would be considered 'a better mix of leisure activities' is explained in greater depth within the retail chapter (e.g. paragraph 6.7). | No amendments proposed. |
| 805615 | Lambert Smith Hampton | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151656 | AS1.2 "The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area' retains its focus on the development of "advanced engineering and research development particularly in renewable and marine off-shore and manufacturing and subsea technologies' along the North Bank of the Tyne. This area includes Morston Quays that is owned by the Port. In view of the comments made above it would | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | Comment noted, to ensure consistency between the River Tyne North Bank policy and the Wallsend Sub-Area a reference will be added to criteria a. of policy AS1.2 (now AS8.1). introducing reference to the wider economic role of the river corridor. | Criteria a. now read "The north bank of the River Tyne will provide a range of opportunities for investment and economic development and support growth in advanced engineering, research and development particularly |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | seem appropriate to remove the Port's land holdings from this policy or that the policy is expanded to introduce support for more general business uses reflecting the revisions made to the other policies as supported above. | | | | in renewable and marine off-shore manufacturing and sub sea technologies." |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152133 | Paragraph 4.15- much of the riverside environment is not 'natural', but rather man-made and, in many respects, historic. | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152133 | Map 3 could usefully depict, and in so doing help to celebrate, the existence and extent of the World Heritage Site. | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | Comments noted. Map has been amended to highlight the world heritage site. | Amendments to map 3. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152133 | Paragraph 4.17 rather underplays the role of Segedunum, although I am pleased to note that Policy AS 1.2 goes some way to correcting this by acknowledging its value. | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | Comments noted. | Para 4.17 now reads "to learn about its Roman history at Segedunum," Note para 4.17 is now 11.5. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152133 | In relation to f). more could be made of the remarkable shipbuilding heritage of the area and the depth of heritage in the area generally which is thought to justify conservation area designation. | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | Comment noted. | "shipbuilding heritage" added to point f. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152133 | Paragraph 4.20- recognition of the World Heritage Site requires not just appropriate protection for it, but a pro-active approach to enhancing its role in the regeneration of the area. | | AS 1.2 The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area | Comment noted. Policy AS1.2 supports the promotion of the WHS. Para. 4.20 will be amended to reflect this. Note - it is now AS8.1 and para. 12.8. | "and support its role in the regeneration of Wallsend." added to the end of para. 12.8. |
| 459177 | | RESIDENT | LP2015305 | Traffic, congestion and parking issues are terrible in North Shields town centre, particularly around Norfolk Court and Albion Road. | | AS 1.3 The North Shields Sub Area | Comment noted. Enhancing entrances into the town centre and the entrance to the Beacon Centre car park, which can accommodate 423 parking spaces, is reflected in Local Plan Policy AS6.5 and would hopefully relieve some of the pressure for parking in other areas of the Town. Note policy AS6.5 is now AS8.13 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|--|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| 396412 | Northumb erland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATI ON | LP2015499 | NWT is fully in support of this policy, especially AS/1.3a. Where possible these elements should be mutually supportive. This statement remains current. | | AS 1.3 The North Shields Sub Area | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 797386 | | | LP20151040 | The Northumberland Square area is a very important part of drawing businesses to North Shields and persuading them to stay. The Council's initiative in applying for Heritage funding is very welcome. | | AS 1.3 The North Shields Sub Area | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/R EGIONAL/OR GANISATION | LP20151321 | Policy AS 1:3 The North Shields Sub-area. CPRE can support this policy. Clause c) should refer to access from the Metro as well as the town centre. | | AS 1.3 The North Shields Sub Area | Comments noted. We would describe the Metro, as well as a range of bus services, as being within the town centre. | No amendments proposed. |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTAN CY | LP20151484 | General support expressed for the policy and its reasoned justification. | | AS 1.3 The North Shields Sub Area | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899323 | | | LP20151609 | Within North Shields, NewRiver Retail supports the Council's commitment to "Attract new investment by enhancing the town centre's image as an inviting place to live, work, shop and enjoy" as set out in Policy AS1.3. Along with the potential refurbishment of the centre, the Policy will provide retailers with confidence to invest in the Beacon Centre. | | AS 1.3 The North Shields Sub Area | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899297 | | | LP20151695 | I would be fully in support of this policy, especially AS/1.3a. Where possible these elements should be mutually supportive. | | AS 1.3 The North Shields Sub Area | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900308 | Places for People | | LP20151782 | (Comments with input from Urban Splash) We acknowledge and support the inclusion of policy AS1.3: The North Shields Sub Area and particularly the recognition of (e.) "the permitted Smith's Dock major brownfield development site will be recognised as key to driving future regeneration and investment at the New Quay, Fish Quay and North Shields | | AS 1.3 The North Shields Sub Area | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | town centre. Places for People support efforts to revitalise North Shields town centre and Fish Quay, and improve links to the surrounding area as services and amenities there that will complement Smith's Dock development. | | | | |
| 806149 | New River Retail | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151878 | We support the identification of North Shields as a focus for new retail, leisure and other main town centre uses and its improvement through a comprehensive approach to social, economic and physical regeneration, together with enhanced shopping, leisure provision, offices and homes. Furthermore the plan seeks to regenerate the Coast from North Shields Fish Quay to St Mary's Lighthouse in Whitley Bay, enhancing its image through a coordinated approach to delivering regeneration schemes with new facilities and improved public realm to develop the tourism and visitor offer whilst safeguarding the natural landscape and wildlife habitat. We further support the proposed regeneration of the Riverside and the opportunities brought about by the promotion of the heritage-led regeneration of North Shields Fish Quay as an increasing draw for visitors and tourists. The sub-area strategy and vision for North Shields as identified in Policy AS1.3 and the specific strategies focussing on Fish Quay and New Quay conservation areas, as set out in Policy AS1.4 are welcomed as a means of attracting new investment by significantly enhancing the town centre. The inclusion of these policies within the plan will help direct investment and enable a more robust stance to be taken to defend this area in line with the emerging | | AS 1.3 The North Shields Sub Area | Comment noted. The Local Plan does seek to revitalise its town centres (Objective 5) and supports a town centre first approach towards new development for main town centre uses in accordance with NPPF. Proposals for town centre uses that come forward outside of defined centres will need to consider the impact in accordance with Policy DM6.10 (now DM3.4 Assessment of Town Centre Uses) that requires proposals over a certain floorspace threshold to commission an impact assessment considering the following criteria: g. the proposal would have no significant adverse impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and h. the impact of the proposal on the vitality and viability of a Town Centre, including consumer choice and trade in the Town Centre. It is through this specific policy mechanism that the Local Plan seeks to test the effects of application proposals that come forward outside of defined centres to promote a town centre first approach and encourage investment into its town centres. The Council are committed to working with | Contacted the agents to request any potential amendments to the policy that could further strengthen the town centres or if they are aware of any future regeneration proposals for the town centres. Amend wording in first line of paragraph 6.57 (now para 6.30) to add the words 'with national guidance.' which was missing from the previous version. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | regeneration strategy and wider strategic vision for this part of the Borough. However, although we support the wider objectives and strategy of the Plan, we believe that it should include a specific policy mechanism for testing the effects of application proposals that come forward outside the defined North Shields regeneration areas, in order to ensure that they will not have any material adverse effects on any aspects of the regeneration strategy. Safeguarding the defined areas in this way and guiding development activity will be an important part of securing the necessary investment in the regeneration areas and we object to the Plan's lack of specific policy framework on this point, | | | respondents through the Local Plan consultation process and will seek to engage in further discussion with the respondent on this issue. | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151932 | Natural England supports this policy. | | AS 1.3 The North Shields Sub Area | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015500 | NWT is broadly in support of this policy but would add that the built environment in this area performs a vital function in support of the ecosystem i.e.: kittiwakes breeding at the Tyne Ferry Landings, arctic terns at the Albert Edward Docks, etc. We would suggest that the policy would benefit from including the area connecting the quayside to the marina and that this could support artificial nesting areas for species which would add interest to the offer as well as support biodiversity initiatives. This statement remains current. | | AS 1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay | The area delineated by the boundary in this policy is that of the Fish Quay and New Quay Neighbourhood Plan SPD that was adopted in 2013 and the aims of the policy mirror the aspirations of that document. It would not be suitable to amend the boundary now. The biodiversity quality of the area described is noted and the policies within the Natural Environment chapter and policy AS1.3 (now policy AS8.11) of the Local Plan provide relevant support. | No amendments proposed. |
| 633349 | | | LP2015613 | I would like to offer the following comments on the local area plan, and as such I have focused on aspects of the plan that may affect my local area (North Shields and the Fish Quay). I was pleased to see the Fish Quay | | AS 1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay | Comments noted. The number of dwellings stated are "potential". It is necessary that potential dwelling numbers are included to illustrate that the Plan can deliver the Borough's objectively assessed housing | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Neighbourhood Plan incorporated in to this higher Local Area Plan, as was promised. However, my main area of concern is the number of dwellings provide for each identified development site within the Fish Quay/North Shields area. As a layperson I have difficulty in visualising how many dwelling can be accommodated on each site, and fear that the numbers may be too high. High numbers of dwellings will inevitably mean additional volumes of traffic and parking, and I would not wish to see residents competing with visitors or businesses for resources. North Shields and the Fish Quay are a tightly constrained area and the possibility of high-density developments will negatively impact on an area that is already attempting to re-generate itself. There is already ongoing dialogue over the issues of parking, rubbish, and services. Adding to this by possible further conflicts of interest between business, residents and visitors needs to be avoided. The provision of dwelling numbers for each identified development site is troublesome. The numbers provided in the Plan will in all likelihood be taken as minimum (starting volumes), rather than the maximum, nor will they be used as guidelines. It is possible that good design can provide for more dwellings, but this should be the outcome of consultation with the local residents and users of the area, and agreement on density. It would be useful if the Plan could: 1. Plainly state that the numbers for housing shown are a guide, and that density will be agreed as</p> | | | <p>requirement. Any housing sites that come forward would have to be assessed through the planning application process where the policies in the Plan will guide decisions on the suitability of a development in terms of impact on infrastructure, etc. DM7.4 "New Development and Transport" for example, ensures that the transport requirements of new development is taken into account. s106 and/or CIL will be pursued where necessary and will be calculated and utilised in accordance with national policy and guidance.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | part of a local pre-project consultation with all interested parties; and 2. Made clear that: a. Developers will need to provide justification for the number of dwellings in their plan, as well show provisions of appropriate infrastructure investment to match the needs of the proposed level of development; b. The use of section 106 clauses and community infrastructure levies will be used to provide any necessary additional infrastructure and facilities (e.g. parking and refuse), to overcome any conflicts, concerns or problems within the local area; and c. That the levies will be applied to the development site in question and not across the borough. | | | | |
| 741945 | FISH | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015723 | The FISH Group would like to offer the following comments on the Local Area Plan. The Group have obviously focused on aspects of the plan that may affect the Fish Quay and local area. Overall the Group was pleased to see the Fish Quay Neighbourhood Plan incorporated in to this higher Local Area Plan, as was promised. Our main area of concern is the possibility of high-density developments in an already constrained area. Whilst we wish to encourage development, re-generation and growth within the Fish Quay area, we are concerned about the possibility of over development. As lay people, we have a difficulty in visualising how many dwelling can be accommodated on each site, and one concern is that the numbers provided against each development will become the maximum, not minimum, nor will they be used as a guide. It is possible that good design can provide for higher density of dwellings, but | | AS 1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay | Comments noted. The number of dwellings stated are "potential". It is necessary that potential dwelling numbers are included to illustrate that the Plan can deliver the Borough's objectively assessed housing requirement. Any housing sites that come forward would have to be assessed through the planning application process where the policies in the Plan will guide decisions on the suitability of a development in terms of impact on infrastructure, etc. DM7.4 "New Development and Transport" for example, ensures that the transport requirements of new development is taken into account. s106 and/or CIL will be pursued where necessary and will be calculated and utilised in accordance with national policy and guidance. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>the final agreed numbers should be the outcome of consultation with the local residents and users of the area, and agreement on density. Over development will impact on already stretched infrastructure and services. In an area that is already attempting to revive itself, and which is already dealing with infrastructure issues, further conflicts of interest between business, residents and visitors need to be avoided. High-density sites will inevitably means additional volumes of traffic and parking, and we would not wish to see residents competing with visitors or businesses for resources. It would be useful if the Local Plan could definitively state that formal consultation will be required for each and every site earmarked for development, and that developers will be required to provide justification for the number of dwellings in their plan along with matching levels of infrastructure investment to match the needs of the proposed level of development. Along with clarity over consultation, it would also be useful to see it stated that the use of Section 106 clauses and Community Infrastructure Levies will be used to provide the necessary additional infrastructure (e.g., parking) and facilities required to overcome any conflicts, concerns or problems within the local area. And that these levies will be used/applied to the development site in question and not, as may be the case, across the wider borough.</p> | | | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151322 | <p>Policy AS 1:4 The Fish Quay and New Quay. CPRE can support this policy but in clause c) there is a need to stress the designation and</p> | | AS 1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay | <p>This policy takes the key objectives of the Fish Quay Neighbourhood Plan SPD. More detail on these objectives, such as those</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | protection of wildlife corridors between the green spaces to promote ecological connectivity. Clause f) should refer to access from the Metro as well as the town centre. | | | suggested, is contained within that SPD. | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151696 | I am broadly in support of this policy but would add that the built environment in this area performs a vital function in support of the ecosystem "" i.e.: kittiwakes breeding at the Tyne Ferry Landings, arctic terns at the Albert Edward Docks, etc. I would suggest that the policy would benefit from including the area connecting the quayside to the marina and that this could support artificial nesting areas for species which would add interest to the offer as well as support biodiversity initiatives. | | AS 1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay | The area delineated by the boundary in this policy is that of the Fish Quay and New Quay Neighbourhood Plan SPD that was adopted in 2013 and the aims of the policy mirror the aspirations of that document. It would not be suitable to amend the boundary now. The biodiversity quality of the area described is noted and the policies within the Natural Environment chapter and policy AS1.3 (now policy AS8.11) of the Local Plan provide relevant support. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900308 | Places for People | | LP20151783 | (Comments with input from Urban Splash) We support the more specific strategic focus on Fish Quay and New Quay (AS1.4) which aims to see the area transformed into a vibrant mixed-use area for housing, employment and tourism. | | AS 1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 806149 | New River Retail | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151879 | We support the identification of North Shields as a focus for new retail, leisure and other main town centre uses and its improvement through a comprehensive approach to social, economic and physical regeneration, together with enhanced shopping, leisure provision, offices and homes. Furthermore the plan seeks to regenerate the Coast from North Shields Fish Quay to St Mary's Lighthouse in Whitley Bay, enhancing its image through a coordinated approach to delivering regeneration schemes with new facilities and improved public realm to develop the tourism and visitor offer whilst safeguarding the | | AS 1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay | Comments noted. The Local Plan provides a positive strategy to attract investment into the priority regeneration areas. Policy controlling main town centre uses in out-of-centre locations and their impact upon town centres is provided in policy DM3.4 Assessment of Town Centre Uses. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | natural landscape and wildlife habitat. We further support the proposed regeneration of the Riverside and the opportunities brought about by the promotion of the heritage-led regeneration of North Shields Fish Quay as an increasing draw for visitors and tourists. The sub-area strategy and vision for North Shields as identified in Policy AS1.3 and the specific strategies focussing on Fish Quay and New Quay conservation areas, as set out in Policy AS1.4 are welcomed as a means of attracting new investment by significantly enhancing the town centre. The inclusion of these policies within the plan will help direct investment and enable a more robust stance to be taken to defend this area in line with the emerging regeneration strategy and wider strategic vision for this part of the Borough. However, although we support the wider objectives and strategy of the Plan, we believe that it should include a specific policy mechanism for testing the effects of application proposals that come forward outside the defined North Shields regeneration areas, in order to ensure that they will not have any material adverse effects on any aspects of the regeneration strategy. Safeguarding the defined areas in this way and guiding development activity will be an important part of securing the necessary investment in the regeneration areas and we object to the Plan's lack of specific policy framework on this point, | | | | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbr | | LP20151900 | NHSN broadly supports this policy but would add that the built environment in this area performs a vital function in support of the ecosystem "" i.e.: kittiwakes breeding at the | | AS 1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay | The area delineated by the boundary in this policy is that of the Fish Quay and New Quay Neighbourhood Plan SPD that was adopted in 2013 and the aims of the policy | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | ia | | | Tyne Ferry Landings, common terns at the Albert Edward Docks, etc. We would suggest that the policy would benefit from including the area connecting the quayside to the marina and that this could support artificial nesting areas for species which would add interest to the offer as well as support biodiversity initiatives. | | | mirror the aspirations of that document. It would not be suitable to amend the boundary now. The biodiversity quality of the area described is noted and the policies within the Natural Environment chapter of the Local Plan provide relevant support. | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151933 | Natural England supports the requirement of this policy to be compliant with policy DM8.6 in order to ensure that there are no adverse effects on internationally designated sites. | | AS 1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152135 | Policy AS 1.4 says nothing about bringing existing buildings which make a positive contribution to the conservation area at the Fish Quay and New Quay into good repair and reuse. Many are heritage assets and some will be at risk. The Policy should also seek to address issues relating to the public realm beyond the green spaces the subject of AS 1.4(c). | | AS 1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay | The policy outlines the main objectives of the Fish Quay and New Quay Neighbourhood Plan SPD that was adopted in 2013. The SPD provides further detail on these objectives and others, including those related to public realm issues in the area. The Local Plan's policies on the Historic Environment and Heritage Assets support the enhancement of heritage assets, especially those at risk. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901309 | Council for British Archaeology North | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152214 | We are pleased to see Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) adopted and in your engagement of the local community as a Neighbourhood Plan pilot for the Fish Quay area. | | AS 1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay | Comments noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 879379 | | | LP201540 | Why are we not developing areas that are already an eyesore and could bring in further tourism and revenue to the area? I am talking about the Tynemouth open pool which was remained a horrible eyesore for years, but along with the already large local support base could be turned into a highly attractive (and profitable) amenity for locals and tourists alike. I have no doubt that if the | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comments noted. The Local Plan contains policy AS5.8 "Tourism and Visitor Accommodation at the Coast" (now policy AS8.16). In April 2014 the Council adopted the Tynemouth Village Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document that includes the restoration and re-use of the Pool as a high priority. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | council supported the already established campaign to reinstate the outdoor pool to its former glory, the benefits of extra tourism will reap rewards for bringing in extra money to the area. I strongly believe we should developing already existing areas such as the Tynemouth pool to improve the area before we start developing further green sites. I can only hope that the council reads this and takes it into consideration. | | | | |
| 891065 | | RESIDENT | LP2015193 | This is, I expect, your strategic planning for the creation of jobs and building homes. Do you have any plan for Whitley Bay? Or any, say, for the Dome and Spanish City? If so, why has it not bore fruit for the last decade? It is time that you did something for the neglected Whitley Bay - simple things other than your so-called strategic planning. One simple and common sense action: when local authority's men cut grass in residential areas, then they should collect the cut grass!! Do you do that in your own garden? North Tyneside's so-called planners and policy makers are devoid of some of the most basic management/admin skills, never mind planning and strategic thinking. | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | North Tyneside Council has recently approved a Masterplan for the regeneration of Whitley Bay. North Tyneside's Local Planning authority does not manage the cutting of grass within the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805724 | | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015271 | Support expressed generally for the policy and its reasoned justification. | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 814591 | | | LP2015346 | It would be great to see Whitley Bay come to life again as a nice place to live with varied shops in the centre to support those who live and (hopefully) work there. Should all of the stations not get a hand up the regeneration ladder, not just Tynemouth Safer cycling routes away from the traffic are to be hoped | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comment noted and the echoed by the objectives of the Local Plan. Regeneration of the Metro Stations are principally the responsibility of Nexus but the investment of upgrading existing stations is included in criteria a) of Policy S10.3 Transport (now policy S7.3). | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | for. | | | | |
| 894746 | | RESIDENT | LP2015448 | Imagine a future after regeneration. A sunny day with lots of leisure and culture activities for all. A great community, with excellent local shops, a nice environment with lovely green area and lovely plants, places to relax, places to have fun, ice cream. Places to exercise and modern, safe, up-market, classy bars, places to have a nice meal out and places for entertainment and dancing = healthy coastal town, prosperous coastal town. | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comment noted. The Local Plan is intended to allow the opportunities for the regeneration of the coast to create long lasting benefits throughout the Plan period. | No amendments proposed. |
| 895180 | | RESIDENT | LP2015512 | Should not demolish Lower Prom, should develop this into shops to create employment opportunities. We need nice shops in Whitley Bay to stop people going out of town to Silverlink. | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | The Local Plan seeks to encourage the regeneration of the coast with a vibrant town centre for Whitley Bay with a mix of shopping and other town centre businesses. The demolition of the Lower Prom will be considered in detail by the current planning application that has been submitted and at this stage the Local Plan has limited weight in determining the outcome of that decision. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumb erland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATI ON | LP2015619 | NWT is broadly in support of this policy area but is concerned to ensure that the policy is correctly balanced to fully conserve and enhance the natural assets of the coastline and ensure that development is not detrimental to this. In this regard this policy needs to fully recognise the international and national significance of biological and geological features (which are highlighted elsewhere "" cross referencing needed). Currently there is reference to the SPA within the policy however we would add that this policy could also benefit from recognition of | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comment noted. Reference to the recommended Marine Conservation Zone is outlined in paragraph 4.33 and although Policy AS1.5 (now Policy AS8.15) does not refer directly to the designated SSSI sites at the coast these are covered in Policy S8.4 (now Policy 5.4), but reference to SSSI in this Policy will be reviewed. | Policy AS1.5 (now Policy AS8.15) has been amended to include reference to the SSSIs within criteria (c) |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | SSSI status along the entire coast and also the following; Recommended Marine Conservation Zone "" Coquet to St. Marys rMCZ This is an area covered by a recommendation for a Marine Conservation Zone under the provisions of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. | | | | |
| 897641 | | RESIDENT | LP2015652 | Finally there is the quality of life. Nowhere in this part of the borough is ever car free, in fact the frequency seems to be increasing at weekends and holiday periods. Yes to tourism, but the effect of tourists, and further housing development is going to cause a significant deterioration in both the quality of living here, and the health of the residents. I have lived within this area for over 30 years, and the developments so far have changed the landscape beyond recognition. I truly believe that you need to revisit the proposal for whitely bay area. | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comment noted. The balance between tourism and residents and the impacts on traffic at the coast is covered in Policy AS10.5 (now Policy AS8.23), which recognises the need to 'balance competing needs on Whitley Bay town centre road network, including the need to maintain traffic circulation and minimise congestion with opportunities to give greater priority to pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and people with disabilities'. | No amendments proposed |
| 803472 | | RESIDENT | LP2015695 | Council will not be happy until they have ruined Whitley Bay and Monkseaton - roads are already busy and cannot accommodate extra traffic. | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 805689 | | | LP2015815 | I understand that NTC are required to put forward a plan and that you will never please all the people all the time. I understand the | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comments noted. With regards to shop frontages, much shopfront work does not require planning permission and therefore | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>parameters within which you are working in order to have your plan accepted by Government. I understand that you have to base your plan on the evidence provided to you in terms of future population growth etc. I understand that a labour council is always going to try and improve the lives of those less fortunate and in doing so, Whitley Bay has certainly suffered, with the centre - especially Whitley Road looking appalling with all the gaudy shop signage. However, by far my biggest concern right now is the appalling state of the whole area in terms of litter. I am not exaggerating in saying that every single place I walk or drive is badly littered - on the ground, in the hedges and trees and it is hugely depressing. I understand the cuts to services have hit hard - but what on earth is the point of trying to talk up North Tyneside as being a great place to live, work and visit when it looks one huge waste tip?? If you started to tackle this kind of problem and help make the general environment more pleasant to be in, then you may find people become more accepting of your proposals. Talking to two sets of neighbours yesterday, all three of us have recently had punctures after visiting the waste disposal site. If you want to set an example to people - I would start right there and get your people to tidy the place up - it is always in a disgusting mess and I've never seen any of the staff trying to tidy it up. I emailed the council a week ago to find out information about the Spring Clean up - I'm still waiting for a reply. So, before you build another 4,500 homes with all the associated</p> | | | <p>out of our control. However, in recognising the issue, the Local Plan does include policies that aim to ensure good quality shop fronts in those occasions where planning permission is required. With regards to litter, the Planning system primarily deals with the built environment. The Local Plan contains a policy to ensure that new developments provide sustainable waste management (during construction and use) through the provision of recycling facilities and ensure a suitable location for the storage and collection of waste (policy DM7.9 New Development and Waste). However the Local Plan or Planning system are otherwise not able to manage litter. The Council have a Streetcare team who deal with litter issues and they are aware of your concerns. Residents are encouraged to report issues by calling the team or via an online form: http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/403/report-untidy-streets-and-overflowing-litter-bins</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | waste/litter, please do something about this huge fundamental problem and get the area cleaned up. The wheelie bins and weekly collections are adding to the problem - it's not just people dropping litter. I followed a wagon down Marine Avenue and picked up half a tub of coleslaw, a teabag and a plastic meat tray that had been left after a bin was emptied. If each commercial property would just clear up outside their premises each day, that would start to improve things quickly - but there is huge apathy because it looks like the council are simply turning a blind eye to the litter problem. Personally, I would rather pay a 14% rise in my council tax than continue seeing North Tyneside go downhill like this. I'm sure many more residents would get involved in litter clean-ups if you would just make it more easy to join in and set a good example in leadership on the problem. I know I've vented my spleen here - but providing a clean and pleasant environment which is safe for wildlife (God knows how many animals are dying as the result of litter) and pleasing for residents has got to be a priority in winning hearts and minds to your wider agenda. | | | | |
| 797386 | | | LP20151129 | Whitley Bay needs a lot of attention. It needs to move up market. It is currently two towns - the streets where the bars used to be; and the northern and western parts. It is essential to make progress with the Dome - even if all of the funding is not in place yet, why not start by painting it, so that it appears attractive to tourists? Volunteers could do the lower parts, even if one had to pay contractors to do the upper parts. The arcade-type outlets do | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comment noted. The Local Plan sets out in its Objectives the need to revitalise the town centres in the Borough and this is detailed further in Policy AS9.7 (now Policy AS8.19) for Whitley Bay. Spanish City is a critical site in the regeneration of the area and the Local Plan seeks to support the regeneration of the site through a mix of uses that will positively contribute to the tourism offer and support Whitley Bay as a | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | nothing to enhance the area. They suggest to tourists that this is a down market old-fashioned seaside resort. And it is said that many of the streets off Whitley Road are used for housing those whom Newcastle and other areas cannot house - this will do nothing to revitalise the town. You urgently need to set up a group of residents and businesses to work closely with the Council to come up with ways of turning Whitley Bay around. I | | | fun and family friendly destination – Policy AS9.16 (now Policy AS8.18). The Council have already secured some grant funding towards the regeneration of Spanish city but is seeking to secure further funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund that will help deliver the Whitley Bay Masterplan (available to view on the Council website - http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse.shtml?p_subjectCategory=1658), which includes the refurbishment of the Dome. Problems associated with residential institutions in Whitley Bay have been raised in previous consultation responses and Policy AS7.1 (now S4.1)3 (now Policy AS8.21) outlines criteria to assess future applications. The Council is committed to working with the local community to revitalise Whitley Bay. A Master Plan for the regeneration of the Seafront has been approved by the Council following extensive engagement with residents across the borough and work is already advancing on a number of the projects that make up the Master Plan. The Council is also working with Whitley Bay Big Local (which is brings together Whitley Bay residents and businesses) to deliver the vision for the Whitley Bay Seafront Master Plan and their own Master Plan for the Big Local area, which covers the remainder of the town centre. | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151323 | Policy AS 1:5. The Coastal Sub-area. CPRE can support this policy. The encouragement of sustainable transport in clause f) is particularly welcome, but should not be | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | restricted just to this AS policy | | | | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151697 | <p>I am broadly in support of this policy area but am concerned to ensure that the policy is correctly balanced to fully conserve and enhance the natural assets of the coastline and ensure that development is not detrimental to this. In this regard this policy needs to fully recognise the international and national significance of biological and geological features (which are highlighted elsewhere so cross referencing is needed). Currently there is reference to the SPA within the policy however we would add that this policy could also benefit from recognition of SSSI status along the entire coast and also the following; Recommended Marine Conservation Zone "" Coquet to St. Marys rMCZ This is an area covered by a recommendation for a Marine Conservation Zone under the provisions of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. The consultation period for this opened recently. The government announced the designation of the first of these on 22nd November 2013, with a further tranche targeted for 2014. The Coquet to St. Mary's rMCZ is one of those which is currently under consideration. In order to protect the marine environment, the Government has signed up to and made a number of commitments on marine protected areas at a national and international level. These include: 1. Marine Policy Statement (MPS) In this the Government re-stated its vision for ""clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas'. To</p> | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | <p>Comment noted. Reference to the recommended Marine Conservation Zone is outlined in paragraph 4.33 and although Policy AS1.5 (now Policy AS8.15) does not refer directly to the designated SSSI sites at the coast these are covered in Policy S8.4 (now Policy S5.4), but reference to SSSI in this Policy will be reviewed.</p> | <p>Policy AS1.5 (now Policy AS8.15) has been amended to include reference to SSSI's within criteria (c)</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>help deliver this vision the Government with Devolved Administrations has committed to creating an ecologically coherent network of marine protected areas; 2. Biodiversity 2020 A priority action for the England Biodiversity Strategy is to establish and effectively manage an ecologically coherent network of marine protected areas which covers in excess of 25% of English waters by the end of 2016, and which contributes to the UK's achievement of Good Environmental Status under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive; 3. Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) The Government has committed to contributing to achieving the Good Environmental Status of Europe's seas by 2020. This will involve protecting the marine environment, preventing deterioration and restoring where practical, while using marine resources sustainably. The MSFD specifically requires spatial protection measures, which contribute to a coherent and representative network of marine protected areas, to be established and for their management to be in place by 2016; 4. Oslo and Paris Convention (OSPAR): Through this convention, the countries bordering the North-East Atlantic, including the UK, have agreed to establish an ecologically coherent network of marine protected areas in the North-East Atlantic by 2012 and ensure it is well-managed by 2016; 5. Convention on Biological Diversity In 2010 parties to the convention made a commitment that "by 2020 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-----------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape" . Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 Marine Strategy Framework Directive) confers the same consideration of environmental issues afforded to the Natura 2000 sites by the Birds Directive and Habitats Directive. We would therefore contend that a recommended MCZ should be included in the same way that a cSAC would be, i.e.: it has the same level of protection. Having these internationally important features provide opportunities for celebration and could stimulate some of the activity that the plan is seeking to promote "" see the Seabird Centre at North Berwick for example. In this regard St. Marys Island and the lighthouse could act as a focal point and could embrace terrestrial and marine opportunities as an attraction in themselves. Too often these are seen as a constraint. This must be a feature of any new development or redevelopment but should be complimentary to the environmental features i.e.: any development at Curry's Point must be designed in sympathy with the landscape and seascape character. | | | | |
| 806149 | New River Retail | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20151880 | We support the identification of North Shields as a focus for new retail, leisure and other main town centre uses and its improvement through a comprehensive approach to social, | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comment noted. The Local Plan does seek to revitalise its town centres (Objective 5) and supports a town centre first approach towards new development for main town | Contacted the agents to request any potential amendments to the policy that could further |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>economic and physical regeneration, together with enhanced shopping, leisure provision, offices and homes. Furthermore the plan seeks to regenerate the Coast from North Shields Fish Quay to St Mary's Lighthouse in Whitley Bay, enhancing its image through a coordinated approach to delivering regeneration schemes with new facilities and improved public realm to develop the tourism and visitor offer whilst safeguarding the natural landscape and wildlife habitat. We further support the proposed regeneration of the Riverside and the opportunities brought about by the promotion of the heritage-led regeneration of North Shields Fish Quay as an increasing draw for visitors and tourists. The sub-area strategy and vision for North Shields as identified in Policy AS1.3 and the specific strategies focussing on Fish Quay and New Quay conservation areas, as set out in Policy AS1.4 are welcomed as a means of attracting new investment by significantly enhancing the town centre. The inclusion of these policies within the plan will help direct investment and enable a more robust stance to be taken to defend this area in line with the emerging regeneration strategy and wider strategic vision for this part of the Borough. However, although we support the wider objectives and strategy of the Plan, we believe that it should include a specific policy mechanism for testing the effects of application proposals that come forward outside the defined North Shields regeneration areas, in order to ensure that they will not have any material adverse effects on any aspects of the regeneration</p> | | | <p>centre uses in accordance with NPPF. Proposals for town centre uses that come forward outside of defined centres will need to consider the impact in accordance with Policy DM6.10 (now Policy DM3.4) that requires proposals over a certain floorspace threshold to commission an impact assessment considering the following criteria:</p> <p>g. the proposal would have no significant adverse impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and</p> <p>h. the impact of the proposal on the vitality and viability of a Town Centre, including consumer choice and trade in the Town Centre.</p> <p>It is through this specific policy mechanism that the Local Plan seeks to test the effects of application proposals that come forward outside of defined centres to promote a town centre first approach and encourage investment into its town centres. The Council are committed to working with respondents through the Local Plan consultation process and will seek to engage in further discussion with the respondent on this issue.</p> | <p>strengthen the town centres and request any information if they are aware of future regeneration proposals for the town centres. Amend wording in first line of paragraph 6.57 (now para 6.30) to add the words 'with national guidance.' which was missing from the previous version.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | strategy. Safeguarding the defined areas in this way and guiding development activity will be an important part of securing the necessary investment in the regeneration areas and we object to the Plan's lack of specific policy framework on this point, | | | | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151934 | Natural England would encourage a reference to policy DM8.6 in relation to this policy to ensure that it is compliant with the Habitats Regulations. Although it is understood that aspects of this policy are covered in more detail in subsequent policies, referencing DM8.6 here would ensure all relevant aspects of development along the coast that could affect Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar are covered and ensure consistency with the other related policies. Map 5 should also identify the SPA and SSSIs (see advice on Map 1 above). | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comment noted, reference to policy DM8.6 (now Policy DM5.6) will be added. | "This policy has been identified as having the potential to cause adverse impacts on internationally protected wildlife sites. When implemented, regard should be had to policy DM8.6 (now Policy DM5.6) that sets out the requirement for appropriate avoidance or mitigation of, or compensation for, any adverse effects." added at 4.39 (now para 11.52) |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152138 | Paragraph 4.33 -the Coastal Sub Area is adjudged to possess natural and man-made features. It should be acknowledged that many such man-made features are of historic importance. | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comment noted. | Paragraph 4.33 (now para 11.62) has been amended to reflect the importance of conservation areas and heritage assets at the coast. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152138 | Policy AS 1.5- English Heritage welcomes this policy and its focus on the heritage importance of the area. It should be noted that the Lower Promenade should be regarded as a heritage asset, which in this location helps to reinforce the urban nature of this part of the coast, as distinct from the Links area where nature is largely allowed to take its course. | | AS 1.5 The Coastal Sub Area | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 890404 | | | LP2015134 | Annitsford, Fordley and Dudley are already over saturated with housing. The road noise from the A19 to the A1 and on the A189 is intolerable - it goes on and on all night. We can hear the boy racers screaming up the A19 from the Tyne Tunnel, through the Moor Farm roundabout and on up to the A1 all night at the weekends. We can no longer leave our bedroom window open during the night because of the noise. The road through Annitsford has become a rat run. The Northumberland Business Park is full of unlet, unused units which are basically an eyesore. The litter from the fish and chip shop and McDonalds is a disgrace, this is not the fault of the businesses, but it is the fault of the dirty people who buy their food there and then litter the villages and surrounding areas with the discarded wrappings. | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | Comments noted. The objective of this Strategy is to improve the attractiveness and quality of life in the North West of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898030 | | | LP2015696 | Although the North West is "well-served by the local major road network, with the A1, A19 and A189 all within or having junctions in the North West area" it is also a nightmare at peak times with the traffic congestion from the A19 Killingworth\Seghill junction all the way through to the A1 Gosforth Park junction. Before extra houses\employment opportunities are introduced into the North West can I suggest that this route through the North West is improved? Villages such as Camperdown, Burradon & Annitsford are plagued with commuter traffic all trying to escape the congestion. | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | predominantly developer funded separately. The Highways Agency is responsible for works to be carried out on the A19 and A1, and the Council is responsible for works on A189. The Seghill A1/A19 roundabout has received funding for a road widening scheme and the A189 has funding secured for junction improvements as part of the overall £150million funding package. | |
| 791875 | | RESIDENT | LP2015854 | There appears to be more eating businesses here [Wideopen] but a bank would be acceptable, and a wet fish shop, and certainly more industrial activities. | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | Comment noted. The Local Plan encourages more investment in the North West area. The Planning system can give permission for particular uses, such as retail use, but is not able to control the specific type of shop or service that would open. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP20151045 | As" the North West Communities sub-area is a priority area for investment regeneration". Could more be achieved in this area, As AS1,6 (4,43) states "the North West Area well served by major road network A1,A19,A189 and is uniquely placed as gateway into N.T. from Newcastle and Northumberland". Indigo Park is welcomed but could another employment park be sited on the northern border ? AS1,6 (4,48) states." The N.W. Area at present projecting a poor image which can be a discouragement to investors and visitors". The area also has surplus school places at both junior and high school level. | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | Comments noted. The need to improve access to existing employment areas and the overall image of the North West is recognised through this policy. To the south of the area is Indigo Park and to the north Northumberland Business Park, which whilst in Northumberland, adjoins the North West. Within the North West any further new employment land would require Green Belt deletions. This is not justified by the forecasted employment needs of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151300 | AS1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area This policy is supported in that it recognises "the excellent services and facilities" within the North West area (criterion a). | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/OR | LP20151324 | Policy AS 1:6. CPRE can support this policy, with the proviso that care must be taken not | | AS 1.6 The North West | Support noted. The Local Plan contains a suite of policies that aim to protect | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | GANISATION | | to disrupt wildlife corridors or damage wildlife in Weetslade Country Park, along water courses or in the Gosforth Wildlife Reserve, which is in Newcastle but borders on this area. | | Communities Sub Area | biodiversity. | |
| 805535 | | | LP20151568 | As" the North West Communities sub-area is a priority area for investment regeneration". Could more be achieved in this area, As AS1,6 (4,43) states "the North West Area well served by major road network A1,A19,A189 and is uniquely placed as gateway into N.T. from Newcastle and Northumberland". Indigo Park is welcomed but could another employment park be sited on the northern border ? AS1,6 (4,48) states." The N.W. Area at present projecting a poor image which can be a discouragement to investors and visitors". The area also has surplus school places at both junior and high school level. Why build all of the housing on two sites with already congested road networks? Surely the better option would be to also utilise the Annitsford area with its much better access to the major road network. | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | Comments noted. The need to improve access to existing employment areas and the overall image of the North West is recognised through this policy. To the south of the area is Indigo Park and to the north Northumberland Business Park, which whilst in Northumberland, adjoins the North West. Within the North West any further new employment land or major housing allocations apart from Annitsford Farm, would require Green Belt deletions. This is not justified by the forecasted housing and employment needs of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805556 | | | LP20151976 | As" the North West Communities sub-area is a priority area for investment regeneration". Could more be achieved in this area, As AS1,6 (4,43) states "the North West Area well served by major road network A1,A19,A189 and is uniquely placed as gateway into N.T. from Newcastle and Northumberland". Indigo Park is welcomed but could another employment park be sited on the northern border ? AS1,6 (4,48) states." The N.W. Area at present projecting a poor image which can be a discouragement to investors and | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | Comments noted. The need to improve access to existing employment areas and the overall image of the North West is recognised through this policy. To the south of the area is Indigo Park and to the north Northumberland Business Park, which whilst in Northumberland, adjoins the North West. Within the North West any further new employment land would require Green Belt deletions. This is not justified by the forecasted employment needs of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | visitors". The area also has surplus school places at both junior and high school level. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152072 | RE New Site: Russell Square. Our client broadly supports the principles outlined in Policy AS1.6. However, it is considered that the policy needs to be expanded to specifically promote the potential and desirability of the area for housing in the North West Communities Sub Area. This would bring the policy in line with the Spatial Strategy as outlined in Policy S1.1 to deliver most housing development in the North West of the Borough. The supporting text to the policy (paragraph 4.43) recognises that the North West Communities Sub Area is well served by the local major road network, with the A1, A19 and A189 all within or having junctions in the sub area, as well as being well served by cycle ways and bridleways. It also acknowledges that the area serves as a gateway into North Tyneside from Newcastle and Northumberland. Despite recognising the advantages of the North West, the policy, in its current form, makes no reference to the opportunity that these afford for the provision of housing in the sub area. It is clear that settlements in the North West Communities Sub Area, in particular Seaton Burn, provide a suitable and sustainable location for housing development, as is reflected in the Spatial Strategy, due to the benefits provided by the excellent highway and public transport links, which also provide access to job opportunities within North Tyneside, Newcastle and Northumberland. In the context of the above, it is considered that | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | Comments noted. This site lies wholly in the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Assessment, which determined that the current extent of the Green Belt should be retained. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | our client's site provides a suitable site for housing, with the potential to bring regeneration benefits to Seaton Burn and the North West Communities Sub Area, and should be removed from the Green Belt. The location of the site is sustainable by being in close proximity to the A1/A19 junction, numerous bus services, the National Cycle Network and a range of local amenities. The development of our client's site also provides the opportunity to remove anti-social behaviour that currently and has a history of taking place at the site (and land south of Meadow Drive). This comprises trespassing, unlawful use of vehicles and grazing and fly-tipping, which currently take place at the site despite security measures. Anti-social behaviour at the site is unsightly, dangerous and has a significant adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents. As such, it is recommended that the policy is expanded by adding the following wording: ""Support will be given to the provision of new housing development at suitable sites, in sustainable locations, which make a positive contribution towards the needs of the North West Communities Sub Area and the Borough'. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152087 | RE New Site: Land to rear of Front Street, Seaton Burn. Our client broadly supports the principles outlined in Policy AS1.6. However, it is considered that the policy should be expanded to specifically address and promote the potential for employment uses in the North West Communities Sub Area. The supporting text to the policy (paragraph 4.43) recognises that the North West Communities | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | Comments noted. This site lies wholly in the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Assessment, which determined that the current extent of the Green Belt should be retained. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Sub Area is well served by the local major road network, with the A1, A19 and A189 all within or having junctions in the sub area, as well as being well served by cycle ways and bridleways. It also acknowledges that the area serves as a gateway into North Tyneside from Newcastle and Northumberland. Despite recognising the advantages of the North West Communities Sub Area, the policy, in its current form, makes no reference to the opportunity that these afford for employment provision in the sub area. It is demonstrably clear that the North West Communities Sub Area provides an attractive and suitable location for employment development, as evident by the benefits provided by the excellent transport links and proximity to potential employees within North Tyneside, Newcastle and Northumberland. Currently there are no employment land allocations in Seaton Burn and opportunities for further employment development in Seaton Burn are limited by the Green Belt. The Brenkley Colliery employment area (Blezard Business Park) represents the only employment designation in the whole of Seaton Burn and Wideopen. Set against this limited supply is a strong demand for employment space in Seaton Burn, with forecasted future space needs indicating a clear need for additional floor space in Seaton Burn. Demand for employment space at our client's site has already been expressed by operators, including Nixon Kitchens whose support is expressed in their letter in Appendix 2. This additional economic development</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>opportunity will help to address North Tyneside's unemployment issues, specifically in relation to the 18-24 and long-term unemployed categories, which are particularly prevalent in the Borough. In the context of the above, it is considered that our Client's site offers an excellent opportunity to provide a regionally significant employment location by virtue of its unique location adjacent to the A1/A19 junction and public transport connections, which will ensure access to potential employees, as well as being attractive to operators. As such, it is recommended that the policy is expanded by adding the following wording, which would also bring the policy in line with Objective 2: Support will be given to increasing economic activity on suitable sites, which are adjacent to the major road network and well related to existing communities.</p> | | | | |
| 396238 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20152088 | <p>General. 1. Would like to see more recognition of need to have plans for regeneration of former mining villages, especially Dudley and Seaton Burn so that development of current empty sites will allow some structure to the village in the future and provide for current unmet need. 2. As the Northern Gateway (Sandy Lane Bypass) has been omitted from the Plan and there are proposals for further extensive house building in the area as well as the development of the Weetslade Industrial site there is a special need to consider future traffic flows and movements. Work to the south of the Sandy Lane roundabout in front of Gosforth Park is long overdue but Sandy Lane itself has been</p> | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | <p>Comment noted. The importance of the North West and the regeneration of villages in the North West are recognised in Policy S1.1 with further detail provided in Policy AS1.6, AS9.9 and AS9.10 (now Policies AS8.24, AS8.25 and AS8.26). Policies referring to the North West will be amended to "North west Villages rather than "North West Communities". Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements (including along the A1056) to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | over capacity since the 70s ... | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152102 | RE New Site: Land to south of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn Our client broadly supports the principles outlined in Policy AS1.6. However, it is considered that the policy needs to be expanded to specifically promote the potential and desirability of the area for housing in the North West Communities Sub Area. This would bring the policy in line with the Spatial Strategy as outlined in Policy S1.1 to deliver most housing development in the North West of the Borough. The supporting text to the policy (paragraph 4.43) recognises that the North West Communities are well served by the local major road network, with the A1, A19 and A189 all within or having junctions in the sub area, as well as being well served by cycle ways and bridleways. It also acknowledges that the area serves as a gateway into North Tyneside from Newcastle and Northumberland. Despite recognising the advantages of the North West, the policy, in its current form, makes no reference to the opportunity that these afford for the provision of housing in the sub area. It is clear that settlements in the North West Communities Sub Area, in particular Seaton Burn, provide a suitable and sustainable location for housing development, as is reflected in the Spatial Strategy, due to the benefits provided by the excellent highway and public transport links, which also provide access to job opportunities within North Tyneside, Newcastle and Northumberland. In the context of the above, it is considered that | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | Comments noted. This site lies wholly in the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Assessment, which determined that the current extent of the Green Belt should be retained. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | our client's site offers a suitable and deliverable site for housing development. It is located in a sustainable location in close proximity to the A1/A19, with access to numerous bus services, the National Cycle Network and is in walking distance of a range of facilities in the local area. The development of our client's site also provides the opportunity to remove anti social behaviour that currently and has a history of taking place at the site (and land west of Russell Square). This comprises trespassing, unlawful use of vehicles and grazing and fly-tipping, which currently take place at the site despite security measures. Anti-social behaviour at the site is unsightly, dangerous and has a significant adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents. As such, it is recommended that the policy is expanded by adding the following wording: "Support will be given to the provision of new housing development at suitable sites, in sustainable locations, which make a positive contribution towards the needs of the North West Communities Sub Area and the Borough'. | | | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152139 | Paragraphs 4.40-4.42 contain much welcome commentary regarding the heritage of the North West Communities Sub Area, but none of this narrative carries through to Policy AS 1.6. | | AS 1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area | Comment noted. Policy AS1.6 (now Policy 8.24)sets out the general strategy for the NW area, with policies elsewhere in the Plan expanding on the themes. Policy AS9.9 (AS8.25) expands on signposting and promoting the key attractions (including heritage sites) in the area. | No amendments proposed. |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151095 | Green Party The presumption should be against development unless it can be shown that such development would benefit the environment or residents. | | DM 2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable | Comment noted. The government is clear in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to make a presumption in favour of sustainable development a 'golden thread' | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | Development | running through the planning process. The Local authority has to therefore consider sustainable development as outlined in the NPPF as performing three roles within planning, economic, environmental and social. This requires a judgement in planning between the three roles and how these can be best delivered. The Council supports sustainable development and through the Local Plan it is seeking to provide long term benefits for the environment , the economy and its residents. | |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151301 | DM2.1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development This policy is supported as it broadly reflects the NPPF. (4.54) The UDP identified areas of safeguarded land for the plan period to 2006. The safeguarded land has previously been assessed as being in suitable locations where development would make an efficient use of land, is well integrated with existing development, and well related to public transport and other existing and planned infrastructure, so promoting sustainable development. The sites identified as safeguarded land have been acknowledged as having potential for development beyond the UDP plan period, post 2006. The LPCD 2015 has subsequently identified some of the safeguarded land as preferred sites to meet the OAN. However, as comments to section S7.2 highlights the OAN will require revision, in light of the recently released DCLG 2012 based household projections (27 February 2015). As a consequence of this, it is likely that additional sites for residential development will be needed to meet revised | | DM 2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development | Comment noted. The council will continue to monitor the latest data projections that are available and the amount of developable housing land that is available to meet the Objectively Assessed Need to provide a range and choice of genuinely developable and deliverable sites necessary for the Plan to be considered positively prepared, justified and effective in accordance with NPPF. | The Local Plan pre-submission draft has been updated to reflect the latest available evidence of forecast population and household growth. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>OAN within the plan period to 2032. In line with the Council's previous approach a reassessment of the identified safeguarded land is required to meet the increased OAN and to also offer realistic alternative sites to some of the preferred sites identified in the LPCD 2015. There are uncertainties with regard to some of the preferred sites identified to meet the OAN in policy S7.3 specifically in respect of the commencement and completion times, the proposed rates of delivery and the suitability of the sites. These concerns have been substantiated by recent Appeal decisions and concerns raised by statutory consultees; for example Site 3 Annitsford Farm - concerns have been raised with regard to the deliverability of the site due to a significant part of it being identified as within Flood Zone 2 and 3. A reassessment of the developable housing land supply necessary to meet a reassessed OAN (in light of the recently released DCLG Household Projections 27 February 2015) and to provide a range and choice of genuinely developable and deliverable sites is necessary for the plan to be considered positively prepared, justified and effective in accordance with NPPF (182).</p> | | | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151325 | Policy DM 2:1 appears to be in line with the NPPF concept of sustainable development | | DM 2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151485 | General support expressed for the policy and its reasoned justification. | | DM 2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | Development | | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151935 | Natural England supports this policy. | | DM 2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 830576 | Taylor Wimpey | DEVELOPER | LP20151980 | policy DM2.1 sets out the Council's proposed policy reflecting the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development. The policy is positively worded and is supported as part of these representations. | | DM 2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152003 | The consortium fully supports Policy DM2 which seeks to promote sustainable development in accordance with NPPF. | | DM 2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152018 | Policy DM2.1 the presumption in favour of sustainable development is supported and seems to accord with the PINS advice on including a specific policy to reinforce the NPPF overarching policy drive. | | DM 2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015497 | Paragraph 118 of NPPF requires that if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. Point 118 of this policy states that "wherever possible [to] address identified impacts of a proposal upon designations that seek to protect and/or enhance the Borough's natural environment". To include the words "wherever possible" would therefore be contrary to NPPF. We welcome the removal | | DM 2.2 General Development Principles | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | of the statement "wherever possible€ . | | | | |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151726 | 14. The HBF support the removal of the prioritisation of brownfield land from the previous version of this policy. This is considered in conformity with our previous comments and the NPPF. | | DM 2.2 General Development Principles | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151936 | Natural England supports this policy. | | DM 2.2 General Development Principles | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152140 | Policy DM2.2 (now S1.4)(e) refers to the need to address impacts upon designations which seek to protect/enhance the Borough's heritage assets. It should be noted that not all heritage assets are designated as such. Paragraph 4.52- some brownfield sites are important for their heritage value. However, this in itself may not be an impediment to development if approached in a manner which respects this value. Policy DM8.1 5 should explicitly acknowledge this. | | DM 2.2 General Development Principles | Comments noted. Agreed that not all assets, built, natural or heritage, will necessarily have a designation. This will be amended. | Criterion e changed to "Have regard to and address any identified impacts of a proposal upon the Borough's heritage assets, built and natural environment." |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151326 | Policy DM 2.2 The proviso "subject to economic viability" in the second para seems superfluous. | | DM 2.2 General Development Principles | Comment is noted but reference at this point is considered key to ensuring recognition that economic viability is a key component in considering development in North Tyneside. | No amendments proposed |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151486 | Support expressed for the policy. As a general comment it is noted and supported that the development of previously developed sites that are not of high environmental value are encouraged where proposals accord with the strategic, development management and / or area specific policies in the Plan. This approach needs to be followed through into the Plan and in particular into policy S7.3 | | DM 2.2 General Development Principles | Comment noted and support welcomed. The specific details of the site to the rear of Midhurst Road will be considered within the response to policy 7.3 (now Policy S4.3). | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | which proposes the allocation of a number of Greenfield sites but does not propose the allocation of previously developed land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA ref 298). This is addressed in more detail in the response to policy S7.3. | | | | |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151794 | Moving on, we are pleased to see that the General Development Principles of the LPCD (DM2.2 (now S1.4)) include reference to both climate change mitigation (b) and infrastructure capacity (f). Having said this, we would like to see specific reference to the reduction of flood risk from all sources, which is omitted from this section. Equally, whilst the importance of the provision for new or additional infrastructure requirements is recognised within this section, we would emphasise the need for early consultation and phasing plans as part of this principle. | | DM 2.2 General Development Principles | Comment noted and the suggested amendments will be incorporated into the Plan as it progresses to the next stage of public consultation. | Reference to supporting a reduction to flood risk from all sources has been added to criteria b of this policy. |
| 830576 | Taylor Wimpey | DEVELOPER | LP20151981 | policy DM2.2 (now S1.4) setting out the general development principles is also positively worded and is supported as part of these representations. | | DM 2.2 General Development Principles | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152019 | Policy DM2.2 (now S1.4), The initial part of this policy seems sensible in that applying a preference to development sites that are identified and allocated via the plan however the latter part raises some concerns in relation to how this policy would be applied via the development management process as such the following questions need answering as to the function and usability of this policy in line with the requirement of the NPPF paragraph 154 "only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal | | DM 2.2 General Development Principles | Comments are noted. The stated concerns with the application were not the stated intention... for example concerns regarding making a positive contribution towards evidence based needs for development could be considered with reference to the minimum delivery that is set out for housing, employment and retail provision in the local plan... i.e. the Local Plan is seeking to support development of at least 828 new homes per year. However, in seeking to clarify its future | The policy has been reclassified as a strategic policy that sets out principles to be guided through the rest of the Local Plan. The policy wording has been revised as follows "Proposals for development will be considered favourably where it can be demonstrated that they would accord with the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>should be included in the plan" . 1. Would any other development proposal (other than those permitted by the initial part of this policy) have to demonstrate compliance with all 6 sub criteria of the policy or would this be a sequential preference applied? 2. Sub criteria (a) states "Make a positive contribution to evidence based need for development" which seems to imply that certainly for residential development once the LPA can demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of development, no other development will be permitted, is this the intention of this policy? Persimmon Homes have significant reservations at the usability and intent of this policy as firstly it seems vague and very wide reaching and seems to provide a cap on development which could continue to provide positive development within the North Tyneside area over and above that planned for within this document. The NPPF is clear that housing targets should not be a cap on development and should in all cases be applied as a minima, with that in mind at the very least we would object to the inclusion of sub criteria (a) as this would not allow any development over and above that required (as a minimum) by the Council's 5 year supply or otherwise. This policy as currently worded is confusing and needs additional clarification on its usability and ensure that it does act to restrict or frustrate development which could provide sustainable development in the future.</p> | | | <p>application between varying types of development the policy has been amended.</p> | <p>strategic, development management or area specific policies of this Plan. Should the overall evidence based needs for development already be met additional proposals will be considered positively in accordance with the principles for sustainable development. In accordance with the nature of development those proposals should: a. Minimise the impact and mitigate the likely effects of climate change and support reduction in flood risk from all sources." Subsequent criteria remain unchanged.</p> |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152093 | RE New Sites: Land to rear of Front Street, Seaton Burn Our client supports the revision | | DM 2.2 General | Comments noted. This site lies wholly in the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | of Policy DM2.2 (now S1.4): d) to "Make the best and most efficient use of available land" , as this brings the policy in accordance with paragraphs 17 and 111 of the NPPF. It is considered that our client's land meets the criteria set out in Policy DM2.2 (now S1.4) by providing an available site that can be easily accommodated by existing facilities and infrastructure, and would make a positive contribution towards the employment needs of the Borough and local area. As a result of the opportunity provided by the site's unique location, it should not be included in the Green Belt. | | Development Principles | Green Belt Assessment, which determined that the current extent of the Green Belt should be retained. | |
| 463028 | | | LP201578 | A Green Belt should separate areas of development. Having one at the North of North Tyneside is pointless, as it separates North Tyneside from the green spaces of Northumberland! I think all new development should be done on brownfield sites, bit if you really need to build on greenfield sites, this is the place to do it. Keep the heart of North Tyneside green! | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | Green Belt can only be designated through the development plan process and any subsequent changes, whether additions, deletions or minor changes can only be made through any subsequent review of the Plan. The objective of Green Belt policy (NPPF, para.79) is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, with five key roles (para.80) being to: check urban sprawl; prevent neighbouring towns merging; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and character of historic towns; and assist in urban regeneration. The North Tyneside Green Belt plays a role in meeting each of these criteria, as well as performing a wider sub-regional role in preventing conglomeration of the Tyne and Wear conurbation, particularly with Green Belt in Northumberland and Newcastle. This buffer to Northumberland is therefore critical. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to necessitate any change to Green Belt boundaries. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) (now Policies S1.4 and S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> | |
| 396890 | | RESIDENT | LP2015338 | The land at the former Burradon Colliery site (east of Kirklands and recreation ground, north of Greenhills) is to be included in the Local Plan as green field to prevent the future development of the area for housing. | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | <p>This land is within the current extent of the Green Belt, as designated by the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). Green Belt can only be designated through the development plan process and any subsequent changes, whether additions, deletions or minor changes can only be made through any subsequent review of the Plan. This land helps to meet NPPF Green Belt objectives, particularly in checking urban sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to necessitate any change to Green Belt boundaries. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. | |
| 814591 | | | LP2015345 | Yes, please protect the green belt for us and future generations, we all need to be able to touch nature sometimes | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to necessitate any change to Green Belt boundaries. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. The current Green Belt is therefore confirmed under Local Plan Policy S3.1 (now S1.5) and on the Policies Map. | No amendments proposed. |
| 444924 | | RESIDENT | LP2015441 | Murton housing - why not move the 'Green Belt' to run along the edge of existing housing in Monkseaton South to reduce the impact on existing householders? It would seem fairer to do this. | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | Any change to the Green Belt, both addition and deletion, must be proposed through the Local Plan process. In line with NPPF, in order to make such a change exceptional circumstances must be identified. A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to support the Local Plan and this concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity, including that of Monkseaton. | |
| 808139 | | RESIDENT | LP2015647 | I also notice that your protected greenbelt land is to the north of the borough encapsulating the old mining districts to the northwest and west of Earsdon, is actually a brownfield area in places not very well landscaped. Bordered to the north/northwest by the very large Seghill Waste Disposal. Is it not better to have an open landscape Greenfield site within easy access of all the people of the borough and not on the outer periphery of the borough out of reach of most people? | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to necessitate any change to Green Belt boundaries. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. The current Green Belt is therefore confirmed under Local Plan Policy S3.1 (now S1.5) and on the Policies Map. Whilst some of this land is brownfield it still performs an important role in meeting NPPF criteria. However, a wide range of policies also recognise the importance of maintaining and enhancing open space provision throughout the borough in order to provide for the whole of the community. This includes policies under The Natural Environment section, such as S8.1 (5.1) and DM8.3 (5.3), and also in the delivery of new | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | development, for instance S7.4 (now split into 4.4a-c)'Strategic Site Allocations' which highlights the need to ensure an appropriate balance between land utilised for development and open space, both to support wildlife habitats and networks and provide accessible space for recreation and leisure. | |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP2015702 | Why not build some of the 4,500 houses and the 17 hectares employment site in the North West area "" The green belt land lost could be transferred down in to green belt, wildlife corridors on to Killingworth Moor and Murton and preserve the character and identities of the areas. | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | <p>Any change to the Green Belt, both addition and deletion, must be proposed through the Local Plan process. In line with NPPF, in order to make such a change exceptional circumstances must be identified. A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to support the Local Plan and this concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. Principally, there remains sufficient land outwith the Green Belt to meet the identified need for new homes and, therefore, there is no need to consider Green Belt land for development.</p> <p>With regard to both Killingworth Moor and Murton, a comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to guide development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This process will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 4,500 homes, and accompanying development, in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | |
| 805543 | | | LP20151085 | There must be no new housing or industrial developments in North Tyneside on current non-brown field sites. The vast amount of unused industrial buildings, which have no hope of being utilised, should be converted for housing provided full new amenities and water management systems are provided by the developers (and not out of council tax). Conserve not destroy. | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>The Local Plan will ensure that the infrastructure to support new development will be provided when required, with Policy S10.1 (now 7.1) setting out the appropriate mechanisms. When this infrastructure is not economically viable it will require provision by developers or through other funding, with the arrangements being set out in a legally binding planning obligation linked with the grant of planning</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | permission. In due course, developers would also be expected contribute through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) if introduced. | |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151096 | Green Party This Plan does not effectively "check the unrestricted spread of the built-up area of North Tyneside" and in particular does not keep the separation between North Shields and Monkseaton and Monkseaton and Shiremoor. In fact, the Green Belt is just a buffer zone between North Tyneside and Northumberland. It should include areas within the borough. The Green Belt does however contain agricultural land and farming activity which is an essential "but ignored" part of the local economy. | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | <p>Any change to the Green Belt, both addition and deletion, must be proposed through the Local Plan process. In line with NPPF, in order to make such a change exceptional circumstances must be identified. A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to support the Local Plan and this concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. Principally, there remains sufficient land outwith the Green Belt to meet the identified need for new homes and, therefore, there is no need to consider Green Belt land for development.</p> <p>The objective of Green Belt policy (NPPF, para.79) is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, with five key roles (para.80) being to: check urban sprawl; prevent neighbouring towns merging; safeguard the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and character of historic towns; and assist in urban regeneration. The North Tyneside Green Belt plays a role in meeting each of these criteria, as well as performing a wider sub-regional role in preventing conglomeration of the Tyne and Wear conurbation, particularly with Green Belt in</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>Northumberland and Newcastle. This buffer to Northumberland is therefore critical. The land between "North Shields and Monkseaton and Monkseaton and Shiremoor" was allocated as safeguarded land through the UDP, this is land which is identified as potentially being required for development beyond the relevant plan period, in the case of the UDP after 2006. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity, including that of New York, Shiremoor, Monkseaton.</p> | |
| 899455 | | | LP20151287 | Please designate the last remaining green field sites in Benton/Wallsend (17,111, 139, and 110) as Safeguarded land to retain a visual break between the communities of Benton/Forest Hall, Palmersville, and | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Wallsend. This would retain at least some element of their separate identities, support and enhance wildlife corridors, not contribute to traffic congestion</p> | | | <p>year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. As a result, land which was designated as safeguarded land through the UDP, this is land which is identified as potentially being required for development beyond the relevant plan period, in the case of the UDP after 2006, must be considered for development.</p> <p>The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>Further consideration has been given as to the requirement for safeguarded land. A small number of areas are designated as such, through S3.3 (now Policy S1.7) and on</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | the Policies Map and these areas will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. However, it is considered that Sites 17, 111, 139 and 110 will be required to meet the need for both housing and residential development in the borough over the plan period. | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151327 | Policy DM3:1 and DM3. CPRE can support these policies, while expressing general disquiet about the possible impact of the NPPF in enabling possibly excessive or harmful development. | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | General support for Local Plan Green Belt policies noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151328 | Policies S3:1 and DM3:2 Green Belt. CPRE strongly supports these policies. S3.1 could usefully include maintaining the openness of the countryside as an objective of Green Belt, in line with NPPF. CPRE particularly welcomes the decision reported in paragraph 4.61 not to propose any alterations to or deletions from the Green Belt. We also support Policy AS 3:5 Killingworth Open Break. | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | Support for the approach taken is noted. Policy S3.1 (now S6.1) will be amended, with the wording of criteria e) being amended to explicitly refer to the openness of the countryside, as well as encroachment. | Minor amendment to criteria (e) to include openness of countryside. |
| 442914 | Big Tree Planning Ltd | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151515 | I write to make representations to the above document (the 'Plan') on behalf of Mrs Jean Burke, who together with North Tyneside Council is the landowner of a potential development site at land east of Kirklands, Burradon (the 'Site'). The Site has previously been submitted to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment ('SHLAA') and forms site reference 305 in that document. It is considered that the Site is suitable for a residential-led development comprising approximately 500 dwellings with associated infrastructure improvements and local service provision possibly including an extension to | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now DM 4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the Burradon Community Primary School and Recreation Centre located to the west. A site location plan is attached to this letter. Practically all land within the existing urban area is proposed within the Plan to be developed with the exception of the retention of much-needed areas of open space; the loss of which would have a significant detrimental impact on the quality of life of residents throughout the Borough. As practically all developable land outside the existing urban area is designated as Green Belt it is evident that some Green Belt releases are unavoidable if the Council are to meet the objectively assessed housing need. Whilst the NPPF stresses the great importance of Green Belts as a means of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, the overarching presumption in favour of sustainable development requires local plans to meet objectively assessed needs. The NPPF allows for Green Belt boundaries to be altered "in exceptional circumstances" as part of the preparation or review of a local plan, with the focus on promoting sustainable patterns of development. It requires consideration of the consequences of channelling development towards non-Green Belt locations, and also allows land to be excluded from the Green Belt which is unnecessary to be kept permanently open. As discussed above, there is not sufficient land available outside of the Green Belt in North Tyneside to meet the Council's objectively assessed housing need. If existing Green Belt boundaries are to remain unaltered the only option is for the adjoining</p> | | | <p>come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 305). A Review has been undertaken to support the Local Plan, this concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident to require the release of Green Belt land for development. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>authorities of Northumberland County Council and Newcastle City Council to accommodate the undersupply. However, Newcastle City Council has just adopted its new local plan, and Northumberland County Council is at a similar stage to North Tyneside. What's more, both adjoining authorities are relying on significant Green Belt releases in order to accommodate their own objectively assessed housing need. As such, the displacement of North Tyneside's housing requirement to its neighbouring authorities is no more preferable in terms of Green Belt policy. In addition, it is not considered that channelling development to locations outside of North Tyneside would represent a significantly more sustainable option. The Government has made abundantly clear, both in the NPPF and in Ministerial statements; the urgent need to boost significantly the supply of housing and, as far as is consistent with other policies, to meet fully the needs of the relevant housing market area. Set against this is the great importance attached to preserving North Tyneside's Green Belt. Inspectors appointed to examine other local plans, such as the Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy Local Plan and the County Durham Plan, have indicated that the exceptional circumstances required to justify Green Belt releases through the plan-making process only exist if there is an overriding need for development to achieve the strategic objectives and policies of the plan, and either (i) all possible options for development outside the Green Belt have been exhausted,</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>or (ii) the development would represent a significantly more sustainable option than development on non- Green Belt land. In addition, Inspectors have indicated that there should be either no conflict with the purposes and integrity of the Green Belt or, at worst, limited conflict. As explained above, the overriding need for housing is required to achieve the strategic objectives of the Plan and all possible options for development outside the Green Belt have been exhausted. As such, some strategic Green Belt releases will be required in order for the Council to meet their strategic objectives. Potential Green Belt release sites should be considered individually to determine whether there would be any conflict with the purposes and integrity of the Green Belt. The development of the Site east of Kirklands, Burradon would not lead to the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas or neighbouring towns merging into one another; and it would not result in significant encroachment into the countryside. It would have no impact on any historic town, and as mentioned above there is not sufficient derelict and other urban land available within the Borough. As such, if it were developed, there would be no conflict with the purposes and integrity of the Green Belt. The Site could accommodate approximately 500 dwellings, and it would be proposed to maintain a large area of open space towards the centre of the Site, where there is an existing pond. A view of the proposed alteration to the Policies Map is attached to this letter, which shows the Site</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|--|---|
| | | | | as a Preferred Housing Development Site as well as the creation of a large triangular area of green or open space at the Site's centre. There is a legal agreement in place between North Tyneside Council and Mrs Jean Burke which stipulates that the Council's land would be developed and used to provide access thus generating a very significant capital receipt for the Council A full Transport Assessment carried out by Fairhurst has shown that a suitable access can be achieved from the existing roundabout to the south of the Site without the need for any other 3rd party land. | | | | |
| 803900 | Northumberland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151528 | The Council supports the inclusion of references to preventing the merger of Killingworth with Wideopen Dudley/Annitsford and Seghill; Shiremoor/Backworth with Seghill and Seaton Delaval/Holywell; Whitley Bay with Seaton Delaval/Holywell and Seaton Sluice in criteria b of Policy S3.1. We would however welcome reference to the role of the Green Belt in preventing Dudley and Seaton Burn merging with Cramlington in criteria b. | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | The importance of preventing merger of urban areas in North Tyneside and Northumberland is reflected in criteria b) of S3.1 (now S6.1). However it is acknowledged that there is no reference to Cramlington in the policy, therefore criteria b) will be amended with the addition of Seaton Burn/Dudley/Cramlington. | Reference to Seaton Burn/Dudley/Cramlington added to criteria (b) |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151727 | 15. The Green Belt section of the plan indicates that there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant a change to the Green Belt boundary. Paragraph 4.54 notes that there are sufficient sustainable and suitable areas outside of the Green Belt to accommodate the preferred growth strategy until 2032. Providing that the land is also deliverable this would appear a logical conclusion. 16. The HBF does, however, have concerns with regards the level of housing provision within the plan and recommends a | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032 in order to meet the OAN. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | higher overall housing requirement. It is noted that further capacity still exists outside of the Green Belt and as such any further uplift in the housing requirement may not warrant a release of Green Belt, although this would obviously be subject to the level of any uplift. | | | judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now 4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. Given the identified OAN, there are no exceptional circumstances to require release of Green Belt land for development. This is the Council's preferred and evidenced housing requirement to 2032. This position will continue to be monitored through the plan period. | |
| 808917 | BDW North East | LAND DEVELOPER | LP20151772 | BDW note that the council have undertaken an assessment of Green Belt boundaries. We are supportive of the council undertaking the Green Belt review and note that the council has concluded that "no exceptional circumstances exist to require amendments to the existing extent of North Tyneside's Green Belt" . The plan states that there are sufficient sustainable and suitable areas to accommodate the preferred growth strategy until 2032, outside of the Green Belt. BDW believe a Green Belt review is needed. The council should consider releasing Green Belt land to plan for a higher housing requirement than proposed in the LPCD and to meet targets. The council must review the Green Belt boundaries to meet the current target and allow them to plan for a higher housing requirement. | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032 in order to meet the OAN. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now 4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. Given the identified OAN, there are no exceptional circumstances to require release of Green Belt land for development. This is the Council's preferred and evidenced housing requirement to 2032. The Green Belt boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. This position will continue to be monitored through the plan period. | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152020 | Policy S3.1 The Green Belt is generally supported alongside policies DM3.2-4 for related uses. Having reviewed the Green Belt review however the final conclusion of this report is to ensure suitable flexibility that should any future monitoring within the plan process identify the exceptional circumstances for revisions to the Green Belt this would trigger the need for an early plan review process. This identified in paragraph 10.4 on page 47 of your report recommends 3 such example situations where this could happen: "ç A shortage of available, developable land for housing and employment purposes in order to meet the growth requirements set out in the local plan: "ç Significant encroachment into the parcel since original designation: and "ç Implications of further changes to Green Belt in neighbouring local authorities: These elements should be reflected in this policy and picked up in section 11 (Implementation and Monitoring) which is also mentioned later | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | As highlighted through the Green Belt Review, there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. However, it is acknowledged that this position needs to be reviewed throughout the plan period through appropriate monitoring indicators, any future amendment to the Green Belt would have to be made through a review of the Local Plan. | Para added: "In line with national policy, any future amendments to the Green Belt and safeguarded land will be undertaken through review of the Local Plan." |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | in this representation. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152069 | <p>RE New Site: Russell Square On behalf of our client Barmoor Limited we are pleased to provide these representations to the North Tyneside Local Plan Consultation 2015 (February 2015). These representations aim to provide assistance to North Tyneside Council as you continue the preparation of the Local Plan and relate specifically to our client's landholdings west of Russell Square, Seaton Burn (please see attached plan at Appendix A). Our client (Barmoor Limited) considers that their site should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development, given the inappropriate and unjustified Green Belt boundary, as well as the site's sustainable location in Seaton Burn. These representations have been prepared in this context. Paragraph 83 of the NPPF is clear that Green Belt boundaries can be reviewed during the preparation or review of a Local Plan and that at this time, authorities "should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term" . Furthermore, paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that when defining Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should, inter alia, define boundaries clearly using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent and not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. Paragraph 4.54 of the supporting text to Policy S3.1 states that due to the use of previously safeguarded land for</p> | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | <p>The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (DM4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 148). The SHLAA currently concludes that this site is unsuitable for residential development. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>potential new allocations in the emerging Local Plan, there is no requirement to review Green Belt boundaries in North Tyneside. However, our Client considers that the opportunity remains to scrutinise the existing Green Belt boundaries and make appropriate amendments. This is to ensure that the defined boundaries meet the requirements of paragraph 85 of the NPPF and to ensure that flexibility is provided to meet development needs without revising the Green Belt boundary immediately after this plan period. An assessment of the Green Belt boundaries around Seaton Burn confirms that it is necessary to amend the boundaries to meet the requirements of paragraph 85 of the NPPF. Although our Client's site currently lies within the Green Belt, it clear that its inclusion is not necessary to keep the Green Belt permanently open by virtue of its location, which is surrounded on three sides by residential development. As such, the existing Green Belt boundary is not appropriate and should be revised in order to ensure consistency with paragraph 85 of the NPPF, which states that land should not be included if it is unnecessary to keep it permanently open. In addition, there are no justifiable reasons to retain the Site within the Green Belt in the context of the purposes of the Green Belt, in line with national planning policy (NPPF paragraph 80). Development of the site would not affect the purposes of the Green Belt as defined in paragraph 80 of the NPPF, or conflict with Policy S3.1 which seeks to ensure "the separate character of Seaton</p> | | | <p>plan period. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Burn" . It should also be highlighted that the Council's own Green Belt Review 2015 assessed the site as making "a very limited contribution to Green Belt objectives" outlined in NPPF paragraph 80, and that at most, it may make a partial contribution towards directing development towards brownfield sites. It was acknowledged that the site presents potential for removal from the Green Belt. Our Client therefore recommends that the Green Belt boundary around Seaton Burn is appropriately revised in order to exclude our client's site and provide an opportunity for a suitable and deliverable housing site to come forward. [Conclusion] In summary, our client requests that land west of Russell Square is removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing in the Local Plan. The inclusion of the site within the Green Belt is clearly unjustified, as it is not necessary to keep it permanently open, given that it is surrounded by residential development on three sides. The Green Belt boundary should therefore be appropriately revised to exclude our client's site. Exclusion of our client's site from the Green Belt would enable a sustainable site for housing to come forward and contribute towards meeting the needs of the local area and Borough. Exceptional circumstances exist for the site's removal from the Green Belt, including the need to meet housing requirements, a lack of suitable sites in Seaton Burn and the opportunity to remove current anti-social behaviour at the site. Our Client trusts that these representations will be</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | taken into account during the preparation of the North Tyneside Local Plan, and looks forward to engaging with the Council during future consultations. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152080 | <p>RE New Site: Rear Front Street, Seaton Burn. On behalf of our client Barmoor Limited we are pleased to provide these representations to the North Tyneside Local Plan Consultation 2015 (February 2015). This follows on from previous representations submitted in January 2014 in response to the Consultation 2013. These representations aim to provide assistance to North Tyneside Council as you continue the preparation of the Local Plan, and relate specifically to our client's landholdings at land to the rear of Front Street, Seaton Burn (please see attached plan at Appendix 1). Our client (Barmoor Limited) considers that their site should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for employment use, given the site's advantageous location adjacent to the A1/A19 interchange, as well as the distinctive and unique economic development offer it is able to provide. These representations have been prepared in this context.</p> <p>Correspondence from Nixon Kitchens and MacLean Electrical, which supports the site coming forward for employment uses accompanies these representations (please see Appendix 2). [Green Belt Policy S3.1] Paragraph 83 of the NPPF is clear that Green Belt boundaries can be reviewed during the preparation or review of a Local Plan and that at this time, authorities "should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their</p> | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | <p>The Local Plan identifies the overall economic growth expected over the plan period and sets out a strategy to meet this, providing enough land for employment purposes to meet this need. A wide range of sites are identified through Policy S5.2 (now 2.2) and it is considered that these allocations can meet the economic aspirations of the borough, providing enough land for the forecast growth in employment to 2032.</p> <p>This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 384). The SHLAA currently concludes that this site is unsuitable for residential development and a similar assessment for employment development through the ELR results in the same conclusion. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period.</p> <p>Further consideration has been given as to the requirement for safeguarded land. A</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>intended permanence in the long term" . Furthermore, paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that when defining Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should, inter alia, define boundaries clearly using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent and not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. Paragraph 4.54 of the supporting text to Policy S3.1 states that due to the use of previously safeguarded land for potential new allocations in the emerging Local Plan, there is no requirement to review Green Belt boundaries in North Tyneside. However, our Client considers that the opportunity remains to scrutinise the existing Green Belt boundaries and make appropriate amendments. This is to ensure that the defined boundaries meet the requirements of paragraph 85 of the NPPF. An assessment of the Green Belt boundaries around Seaton Burn confirms that it is necessary to amend the boundaries to meet the requirements of paragraph 85 of the NPPF. Our Client's site currently lies within the Green Belt. However, it is not necessary to keep this area of the Green Belt permanently open, given that the site is surrounded on three sides by the A1, the A19 and Front Street, with the urban area of Seaton Burn to the immediate south east. A more appropriate and defensible western boundary to the Green Belt would be Front Street, with an option to exclude all of the land to the east of the A1/west of Seaton Burn from the Green Belt or just exclude our Client's site with the footpath and woodland</p> | | | <p>small number of areas are designated as such, through S3.3 (now S1.7) and on the Policies Map and these areas will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. However, for the reasons set out in the Green Belt Review, it is considered that this land should remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>to the south remaining within the Green Belt. There are no justifiable reasons to retain the Site within the Green Belt in the context of the purposes of the Green Belt, in line with national planning policy (NPPF paragraph 80). It is proposed that the site is excluded from the Green Belt to form part of the A19 Economic Corridor. The exclusion of the site would represent a modest local review of the Green Belt boundary that will create a sustainable extension to an existing settlement and provide sufficient land for future economic use. The exclusion of our Client's site from the Green Belt would not affect the purposes of the Green Belt as defined in Policy S3.1 of the Local Plan. It is considered that the proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary would still ensure the "separate character of Seaton Burn" and would not represent an encroachment into the countryside given that it is bounded on three sides by the A1, A19 and Front Street. Despite expensive security measures put in place by the owners, the site is subject to anti-social behaviour on a regular basis, including the unlawful use by motor vehicles, vandalism, unlawful grazing and fly-tipping. This has proven expensive to deal with and is detrimental to the operation of neighbouring businesses and the setting of Seaton Burn. In addition, it is important to highlight that the Council's own Green Belt Review 2015 demonstrates that the site makes little contribution towards the objectives of the Green Belt outlined in NPPF paragraph 80 and as such recognises that the site makes a</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>limited contribution to the Green Belt. It therefore identifies the site as having potential for removal from the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances exist for the release of the site from the Green Belt. These include the unique strategic location of the site, specific demand from Nixon Kitchens and others, a lack of alternative sites, and the opportunity to remove the unsightly effects of anti-social behaviour. Our Client therefore recommends that the Green Belt boundary around Seaton Burn is amended to remove the site and provide an opportunity for sustainable economic development to deliver the needs of the Borough and local area. If the site is not to be removed from the Green Belt, then it is considered that it should be identified as safeguarded land. This will provide flexibility for the site to come forward for employment uses at an appropriate time in the longer term, and in response to the market, whilst ensuring compliance with paragraph 85 of the NPPF. [Conclusion] To summarise, our Client requests that land to the rear of Front Street, Seaton Burn be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for economic development in the North Tyneside Local Plan. The site is in a unique and advantageous location for employment development due to it being adjacent to the A1/A19 junction. There are no justifiable reasons to retain the Site within the Green Belt in the context of the purposes of the Green Belt, in line with NPPF paragraph 80 and exceptional circumstances exist. The exclusion of the site from the Green Belt</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | would represent a modest local review of the Green Belt boundary that will provide a suitable and attractive opportunity for employment uses. If the site is not to be removed from the Green Belt, then in accordance with the Council's Green Belt Review it should be identified in the revised Local Plan as safeguarded land, to provide appropriate flexibility for it to come forward at an appropriate time in the longer term, and in response to the market. Our Client trusts that these representations will be taken into account during the continued preparation of the North Tyneside Local Plan, and looks forward to containing the proactive engagement with the Council during future consultations. . ADDITIONAL SUPPORT PROVIDED BY Nixons Kitchens and Maclean Electrical - statement provided as response to Policy S5.2. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152099 | RE New Site: Land to south of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn. On behalf of our client Barmoor Limited we are pleased to provide these representations to the North Tyneside Local Plan Consultation 2015 (February 2015). These representations aim to provide assistance to North Tyneside Council as you continue the preparation of the Local Plan and relate specifically to our client's landholdings south of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn (please see attached plan at Appendix 1). Our client (Barmoor Limited) considers that their site should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development, given the site's sustainable location in Seaton Burn. These | | S 3.1 The Green Belt | The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now DM4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>representations have been prepared in this context. Policy S3.1 Paragraph 83 of the NPPF is clear that Green Belt boundaries can be reviewed during the preparation or review of a Local Plan and that at this time, authorities "should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term" . Furthermore, paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that when defining Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should, inter alia, define boundaries clearly using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent and not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. Paragraph 4.54 of the supporting text to Policy S3.1 states that due to the use of previously safeguarded land for potential new allocations in the emerging Local Plan, there is no requirement to review Green Belt boundaries in North Tyneside. However, our Client considers that the opportunity remains to scrutinise the existing Green Belt boundaries and make appropriate amendments. This is to ensure that the defined boundaries meet the requirements of paragraph 85 of the NPPF and to ensure that flexibility is provided to meet development needs without revising the Green Belt boundary immediately after this plan period. An assessment of the Green Belt boundaries around Seaton Burn confirms that it is necessary to amend the boundaries to meet the requirements of paragraph 85 of the NPPF. Our Client's site currently lies within the Green Belt. However it is not necessary to</p> | | | <p>analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 308). The SHLAA currently concludes that this site is unsuitable for residential development. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>keep this area of the Green Belt permanently open. The Site is adjoined by housing to the north and west. Development of the Site would not extend the settlement further south than the residential area to the west along Burnbridge Road. Therefore, the release of the Site from the Green Belt would not compromise the purposes of the Green Belt defined in Policy S3.1, which includes ensuring the "separate character of Seaton Burn" . It is therefore considered that the Green Belt boundary should be revised so that it runs adjacent to the Seaton Burn. This would ensure that the separate character of Seaton Burn is maintained whilst enabling suitable land to come forward to contribute towards delivering future housing needs. There are no justifiable reasons to retain the Site within the Green Belt in the context of the purposes of the Green Belt, in line with national planning policy (NPPF paragraph 80). It is proposed that the Site is excluded from the Green Belt to provide a modest sustainable extension to the settlement and contribute towards meeting housing needs over the plan period. It should also be highlighted that the Council's own Green Belt Review 2015 assessed the site as making "a limited contribution to Green Belt objectives" as outlined in NPPF paragraph 80. The review recognised the opportunity to revise the Green Belt boundary to run adjacent to the Seaton Burn. As such, it was acknowledged that the site presents potential for removal from the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances exist for the release of the site from the Green Belt.</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>In addition to the need to meet housing requirements, these circumstances comprise the lack of suitable alternative sites in Seaton Burn, along with removing the existing anti-social behaviour problems. Our Client therefore recommends that the Green Belt boundary around Seaton Burn is amended to remove the site and provide an opportunity for sustainable residential development to contribute towards the delivery of the housing needs of the Borough and local area. Conclusion To summarise, our Client requests that land South of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development in the North Tyneside Local Plan. The site's inclusion within the Green Belt is not justified in the context of the purposes of the designation, in line with NPPF paragraph 80. The exclusion of the site from the Green Belt would represent a modest local review of the Green Belt boundary and would not compromise the separate character of Seaton Burn. Removal of the site from the Green Belt and allocation for housing would provide a sustainable location for residential development, which will ensure that a sufficient supply of new homes is provided in Seaton Burn over the plan period. Exceptional circumstances exist for the site's removal from the Green Belt, including the need to meet housing requirements, a lack of suitable sites in Seaton Burn and the opportunity to remove current antisocial behaviour at the site. Our Client trusts that these representations will be taken into account during the preparation of</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | the North Tyneside Local Plan, and looks forward to engaging with the Council during future consultations. | | | | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015498 | Paragraph 81 of NPPF states that LPAs should plan positively to enhance the beneficial uses of Green Belt, such as biodiversity. This is not reflected in this policy or in the text of the document in this chapter. Whilst we recognise the significant alteration to this policy and the recognition of the green belt as a biodiversity resource, this policy still does not meet the requirements of Paragraph 81 of NPPF states that LPAs should plan positively to enhance the beneficial uses of Green Belt, such as biodiversity. Recent issues at Backworth, which resulted in significant damage to a Local Wildlife Site, highlight that a pro-active approach to Green Belt enhancements must be included as part of the strategic planning approach if the Green Belt is to provide multi-functional benefits as suggested. NWT is not convinced that current plan policies will address this i.e.; agricultural land use. | | DM 3.2 Positive uses within the Green Belt | Policy DM3.2 (now Policy DM1.6) encourages appropriate and beneficial proposals within the Green belt. The Local Plan will not be allocating areas of greenbelt land for any specific enhancements. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151329 | Policies S3:1 and DM3:2 Green Belt. CPRE strongly supports these policies. S3.1 could usefully include maintaining the openness of the countryside as an objective of Green Belt, in line with NPPF. CPRE particularly welcomes the decision reported in paragraph 4.61 not to propose any alterations to or deletions from the Green Belt. We also support Policy AS 3:5 Killingworth Open Break. | | DM 3.2 Positive uses within the Green Belt | Support for Green Belt policies noted. Response to comment related to S3.1 (now Policy S1.5) is covered under that specific policy. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899297 | | | LP20151694 | Paragraph 81 of NPPF states that LPAs should plan positively to enhance the beneficial uses of Green Belt, such as biodiversity. This is not reflected in this policy or in the text of the | | DM 3.2 Positive uses within the Green Belt | Policy DM3.2 (now Policy DM1.6) encourages appropriate and beneficial proposals within the Green Belt. As highlighted through the Green Belt Review, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | document in this chapter. Whilst it is recognised there has been an alteration to this policy and the recognition of the green belt as a biodiversity resource, this policy still does not meet the requirements of Paragraph 81 of NPPF states that LPAs should plan positively to enhance the beneficial uses of Green Belt, such as " biodiversity. Recent issues at Backworth, which resulted in significant damage to a Local Wildlife Site, highlight that a pro-active approach to Green Belt enhancements by the LPA, must be included as part of the strategic planning approach if the Green Belt is to provide multi-functional benefits as suggested. Current plan policies will fail to address this i.e.; agricultural land use. | | | there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries, either deletion or addition . The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151899 | Whilst we recognise the significant alteration to this policy and the recognition of the green belt as a biodiversity resource, this policy still does not meet the requirements of Paragraph 81 of NPPF states that LPAs should plan positively to enhance the beneficial uses of Green Belt, such as biodiversity. Recent issues at Backworth, which resulted in significant damage to a Local Wildlife Site, highlight that a pro-active approach to Green Belt enhancements must be included as part of the strategic planning approach if the Green Belt is to provide multi-functional benefits as suggested. In particular if there is to be large scale building on green sites in North Tyneside then there will need to be equally large scale sites for ecological mitigation, these could be targeted in the Greenbelt. | | DM 3.2 Positive uses within the Green Belt | Policy DM3.2 (now Policy DM1.6) encourages appropriate and beneficial proposals within the Green Belt. As highlighted through the Green Belt Review, there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries, either deletion or addition . The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152021 | <p>Policy S3.1 The Green Belt is generally supported alongside policies DM3.2-4 for related uses. Having reviewed the Green Belt review however the final conclusion of this report is to ensure suitable flexibility that should any future monitoring within the plan process identify the exceptional circumstances for revisions to the Green Belt this would trigger the need for an early plan review process. This identified in paragraph 10.4 on page 47 of your report recommends 3 such example situations where this could happen: "ç A shortage of available, developable land for housing and employment purposes in order to meet the growth requirements set out in the local plan: "ç Significant encroachment into the parcel since original designation: and "ç Implications of further changes to Green Belt in neighbouring local authorities: These elements should be reflected in this policy and picked up in section 11 (Implementation and Monitoring) which is also mentioned later in this representation.</p> | | DM 3.2 Positive uses within the Green Belt | <p>As highlighted through the Green Belt Review, there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. However, it is acknowledged that this position needs to be reviewed throughout the plan period through appropriate monitoring indicators, any future amendment to the Green Belt would have to be made through a review of the Local Plan.</p> | <p>Para added: "In line with national policy, any future amendments to the Green Belt and safeguarded land will be undertaken through review of the Local Plan."</p> |
| 806166 | | RESIDENT | LP2015476 | <p>I am writing to object strongly to the North Tyneside Local Plan for the following reasons: "ç Given the over-ambitious rates of growth proposed there is no evidence-based justification for the safeguarding of additional land for development beyond the Plan period. For this reason safeguarded sites should be removed.</p> | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | <p>The levels of growth identified in the Local Plan are not considered to be over-ambitious but are realistic, having been fully evidenced by an in-depth analysis of need. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032.</p> | <p>No amendments proposed.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Having defined the Green Belt and the preferred sites to meet the identified development requirements, it is considered necessary to identify areas of safeguarded land that will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. The designation of this land will offer the flexibility in the long-term strategic planning process. | |
| 897295 | | RESIDENT | LP2015600 | Given the over-ambitious rates of growth proposed there is no evidence-based justification for the safeguarding of additional land for development beyond the Plan period. For this reason safeguarded sites should be removed. | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | The levels of growth identified in the Local Plan are not considered to be over-ambitious but are realistic, having been fully evidenced by an in-depth analysis of need. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. Having defined the Green Belt and the preferred sites to meet the identified development requirements, it is considered necessary to identify areas of safeguarded land that will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. The designation of this land will offer the flexibility in the long-term strategic planning process. | No amendments proposed. |
| 897599 | | RESIDENT | LP2015637 | I urge the Council to drop plans to safeguard additional land for future development. | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | Objection to any areas being designated as safeguarded land designations noted. Having defined the Green Belt and the preferred sites to meet the identified development requirements, it is considered necessary to identify areas of safeguarded | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | land that will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. The designation of this land will offer the flexibility in the long-term strategic planning process. | |
| 898208 | | RESIDENT | LP2015724 | Given the over-ambitious rates of growth proposed there is no justification for the safeguarding for additional land for development beyond the Plan period. For this reason safeguarded sites should be removed. | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | The levels of growth identified in the Local Plan are not considered to be over-ambitious but are realistic, having been fully evidenced by an in-depth analysis of need. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. Having defined the Green Belt and the preferred sites to meet the identified development requirements, it is considered necessary to identify areas of safeguarded land that will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. The designation of this land will offer the flexibility in the long-term strategic planning process. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898230 | | RESIDENT | LP2015731 | Given the over-ambitious rates of growth proposed there is no justification for the safeguarding for additional land for development beyond the Plan period. For this reason safeguarded sites should be removed. | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | The levels of growth identified in the Local Plan are not considered to be over-ambitious but are realistic, having been fully evidenced by an in-depth analysis of need. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is considered that these | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. Having defined the Green Belt and the preferred sites to meet the identified development requirements, it is considered necessary to identify areas of safeguarded land that will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. The designation of this land will offer the flexibility in the long-term strategic planning process. | |
| 898375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015760 | Given the over-ambitious rates of growth proposed there is no justification for the safeguarding for additional land for development beyond the Plan period. For this reason safeguarded sites should be removed. | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | The levels of growth identified in the Local Plan are not considered to be over-ambitious but are realistic, having been fully evidenced by an in-depth analysis of need. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. Having defined the Green Belt and the preferred sites to meet the identified development requirements, it is considered necessary to identify areas of safeguarded land that will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. The designation of this land will offer the flexibility in the long-term strategic planning process. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015973 | The safeguarding of additional land for development beyond the Plan period is unnecessary and should be removed from the Plan. | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | Objection to any areas being designated as safeguarded land designations noted. Having defined the Green Belt and the preferred sites to meet the identified | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | development requirements, it is considered necessary to identify areas of safeguarded land that will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. The designation of this land will offer the flexibility in the long-term strategic planning process. | |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151303 | S3.3 Safeguarded Land Policy S3.3 Safeguarded Land, this policy should be amended to include reference to the potential for a local plan review. | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. However, it is acknowledged that this position needs to be reviewed throughout the plan period through appropriate monitoring indicators, any future amendment to the Green Belt and safeguarded land would have to be made through a review of the Local Plan. | Para added: "In line with national policy, any future amendments to the Green Belt and safeguarded land will be undertaken through review of the Local Plan." |
| 472456 | | RESIDENT | LP20151398 | Given the over-ambitious rates of growth proposed there is no evidence-based justification for the safeguarding of additional land for development beyond the Plan period. For this reason safeguarded sites should be removed. | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | The levels of growth identified in the Local Plan are not considered to be over-ambitious but are realistic, having been fully evidenced by an in-depth analysis of need. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. Having defined the Green Belt and the preferred sites to meet the identified development requirements, it is considered | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | necessary to identify areas of safeguarded land that will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. The designation of this land will offer the flexibility in the long-term strategic planning process. | |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151439 | Given the over-ambitious rates of growth proposed there is no evidence-based justification for the safeguarding of additional land for development beyond the Plan period. For this reason safeguarded sites should be removed. | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | The levels of growth identified in the Local Plan are not considered to be over-ambitious but are realistic, having been fully evidenced by an in-depth analysis of need. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. Having defined the Green Belt and the preferred sites to meet the identified development requirements, it is considered necessary to identify areas of safeguarded land that will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. The designation of this land will offer the flexibility in the long-term strategic planning process. | No amendments proposed. |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151728 | 17. The HBF supports the provision of safeguarded land to meet development needs beyond the plan period. The current policy does not set out either the scale or location of the proposed safeguarded land. It is important that prior to the next stage of consultation the Council identify the level of safeguarded land it intends to provide and justify both its scale and location. The final | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | Whilst the location of the safeguarded land is not outlined on a site-specific basis in Policy S3.3 (now S1.7), the areas proposed for this designation are identified on the Policies Map. It is not considered necessary to individually identify each area of land through the policy, although further thought will be given as to the need to identify the location and/or quantity of safeguarded | Para added: "In line with national policy, any future amendments to the Green Belt and safeguarded land will be undertaken through review of the Local Plan." |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>sentence of the policy states that; "These strategic areas of land will be maintained in there open state for at least the plan period' 18. Whilst it is recognised that this is the intention of the plan such a statement within policy provides very little flexibility for an early review of the plan, if required. The NPPF, paragraph 85, identifies that safeguarded land can be released upon plan review. To provide greater flexibility the HBF considers the plan should consider what conditions would trigger a review to enable safeguarded land to be released. The plan currently does not indicate any triggers for such a review. 19. To promote greater flexibility within the plan the Council may wish to consider re-designating some of the safeguarded land as contingency land. This is land which can be brought forward, subject to criteria, to provide additional land within the plan period without the need for a full review. This land can then provide flexibility to support lower rates of delivery than anticipated from the allocations or in reaction to higher than anticipated rates of housing growth. Such an approach has been</p> | | | <p>land in the supporting text. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. However, it is acknowledged that this position needs to be reviewed throughout the plan period through appropriate monitoring indicators, any future amendment to the Green Belt or safeguarded land would have to be made through a review of the Local Plan.</p> | |
| 808917 | BDW North East | LAND DEVELOPER | LP20151773 | <p>We note that the council has identified an area of safeguarded land between the Green Belt and main urban area. The provision of safeguarded land is in accordance with NPPF, para 85. It is important that the level of safeguarded land and its location is adequately justified. The council fails to set out the level of safeguarded land and its location. The council must set out the level of safeguarded land identified and the locations</p> | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | <p>Whilst the location of the safeguarded land is not outlined on a site-specific basis in Policy S3.3 (now 1.7), the areas proposed for this designation are identified on the Policies Map. It is not considered necessary to individually identify each area of land through the policy, although further thought will be given as to the need to identify the location and/or quantity of safeguarded land in the supporting text.</p> | <p>Para added: "In line with national policy, any future amendments to the Green Belt and safeguarded land will be undertaken through review of the Local Plan."</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>proposed, ensuring both are adequately justified. The council should take a more proactive approach to the identification of safeguarded land and identify further housing allocations to ensure the Green Belt boundaries endure beyond the current plan period by providing sufficient land to meet the development needs of the area, without such an approach the plan is likely to be found unsound. In accordance with the NPPF, paragraph 85, local planning authorities should "make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review, which proposes the development" . The plan currently provides very little flexibility for an early review of the plan if required. Although the council has little intention to release safeguarded land, a certain level of flexibility should be built into the plan. BDW would encourage the council to include conditions in the plan that would trigger a review to enable safeguarded land to be released. The council should also consider re-designating some of the safeguarded land as either housing allocations or contingency land to promote greater flexibility. Contingency land is land which can be brought forward, subject to criteria, to provide additional land within the plan period without the need for a full review. This land can provide flexibility to support lower rates of delivery than anticipated from the allocations. This approach has been used</p> | | | <p>The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. However, it is acknowledged that this position needs to be reviewed throughout the plan period through appropriate monitoring indicators, any future amendment to the Green Belt or safeguarded land would have to be made through a review of the Local Plan. Despite this, it is not felt that there are circumstances evident to require reallocated the currently identified safeguarded land as either land for development or as 'contingency land'.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | successfully in a number of Local Plans, including North Lincolnshire. The council should consider re-designating some of the safeguarded land as housing allocations or contingency land. | | | | |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151809 | <p>Policy S3.3 states that there is an area of safeguarded land between the Green Belt and Main Urban Area that is not required for development within the Local Plan period. This safeguarded land is located on the Policies Map adjacent to the A19, directly north of Site 28 West Shiremoor North which has been granted planning permission for 290 dwellings (14/01687/OUT), and Backworth Park which has been granted planning permission for 590 dwellings (13/00781/OUT). The Northumberland Estates consider that this area of land should not be allocated as a Safeguarded Area, as it is likely to be required to meet development needs within the plan period to 2031. The Local Plan emphasises the importance of the A19 Corridor as a key area for growth (Policy S5.1 and Policy AS5.6), given its strategic location for employment and housing land. The Local Plan Policies Map indicates that along the west of the A19 there is significant housing development (West Shiremoor North and Backworth Park), and along the east of the A19 there is the strategic site allocation "'Killingworth Moor' which will include housing and employment land. The safeguarding of this area would effectively sterilise an important area of land outside the Green Belt within the A19 Corridor which is of regional economic significant and a key driver of future growth within North Tyneside. It is</p> | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | <p>The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032, including the sites specifically highlighted in this representation. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now DM4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. This land is included in the SHLAA (Site 11 now Site E0101) but has been assessed as unsuitable for residential development and therefore undevelopable. This conclusion is due to the site being the location of a 'category 1 designation' in the form of the Backworth Medieval Village Scheduled</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | considered that safeguarding this site for the duration of the plan period limits the development potential of the site, and also limits the key benefits that releasing the site and allocating additional housing or employment land would have upon the area. The Northumberland Estates suggest that the Local Plan includes a more flexible policy that promotes this site as an opportunity site for needs that may arise in the plan period, for example educational provision, leisure, or tourism use, which are not provided for elsewhere in the Plan. | | | Ancient Monument (SAM). It is considered that development would harm the fundamental character of this feature and that it would not be possible to deliver a development which would be appropriate. Therefore, this site has not been considered for residential allocation. | |
| 591119 | | | LP20151890 | I am pleased that the small areas marked as site 4 and site 8 are now to be designated as Safeguarded land. Small compensation for the huge loss of all the other open spaces, most recently Whitehouse Farm "" a travesty of justice. Let's hope that really does mean it can't be developed unless there is nowhere else! To, once again imitate the words you used when describing your aims for Whitley Bay, " the aim is to reduce the concentration of these developments and support WEST MOOR to become / continue to be a sustainable community" . | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | Support for proposed designation of safeguarded land noted. Sites 4 and 8 are included for assessment in the SHLAA (Sites 333 & 056) and were considered as potential allocations for development through the Local Plan process. However, on consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retain as safeguarded land, potentially meeting the development needs of the borough post-2032. | No amendments proposed. |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151895 | As it stands the rate of proposed growth is so considerable that there is no evidence based justification for the safeguarding of additional land for development beyond the Plan period, therefore all safeguarded sites should be removed from the Plan. We know that the use of the term "safeguarded land" is confusing to the public who assume that it is safeguarded FROM development, not | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | The levels of growth identified in the Local Plan are not considered to be over-ambitious but are realistic, having been fully evidenced by an in-depth analysis of need. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for | This policy is now S6.3. The following paragraph has been added in order to clarify the role of safeguarded land: "As a result, through this Local Plan the remaining areas of land that are located between the urban area |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | safeguarded FOR development after the plan period. We know this because the residents of West Moor made this mistake during the production of the last local plan. If NTDC wishes to continue to include "safeguarded" land in the plan then it should change the wording used so that it is clear to the public, for example a clearer definition would be "Proposed for future development" . | | | development. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. Having defined the Green Belt and the preferred sites to meet the identified development requirements, it is considered necessary to identify areas of safeguarded land that will potentially be required to meet the development needs of the borough post-2032. The designation of this land will offer the flexibility in the long-term strategic planning process. The term 'safeguarded land' is a formal planning policy designation the role of which, as outlined in paragraph 85 of NPPF, is land that is "between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period" | and the Green Belt are identified as safeguarded land. In line with national policy requirements, the safeguarded land identified on the Policies Map is identified to meet development needs beyond the plan period and therefore is not allocated for development at the current time." |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152022 | Policy S3.1 The Green Belt is generally supported alongside policies DM3.2-4 for related uses. Having reviewed the Green Belt review however the final conclusion of this report is to ensure suitable flexibility that should any future monitoring within the plan process identify the exceptional circumstances for revisions to the Green Belt this would trigger the need for an early plan review process. This identified in paragraph 10.4 on page 47 of your report recommends 3 such example situations where this could happen: "ç A shortage of available, developable land for housing and employment purposes in order to meet the growth requirements set out in the local plan: "ç Significant encroachment into the parcel | | S 3.3 Safeguarded Land | As highlighted through the Green Belt Review, there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. However, it is acknowledged that this position needs to be reviewed throughout the plan period through appropriate monitoring indicators, any future amendment to the Green Belt or safeguarded land would have to be made through a review of the Local Plan. | Para added: "In line with national policy, any future amendments to the Green Belt and safeguarded land will be undertaken through review of the Local Plan." |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | since original designation: and "ç Implications of further changes to Green Belt in neighbouring local authorities: These elements should be reflected in this policy and picked up in section 11 (Implementation and Monitoring) which is also mentioned later in this representation. | | | | |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151094 | Green Party The proposals for the Murton area in particular meet every one of the criteria for not developing the site! | | DM 3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land | Comments noted. The land around Murton was designated as safeguarded land through the UDP, with land to be protected from development for the plan period. This ran until 2006 and now, in considering the most appropriate and sustainable sites for allocation, this area has been identified in order to deliver a proportion of the borough's requirement for growth. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151304 | DM3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land Policy DM3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land, criterion (f) makes reference to "no alternative site is reasonably available, this should also have regard to the viability and deliverability of alternative sites taking into account whether they have realistic prospective of coming forward within the plan period. | | DM 3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land | This comment is noted but the overriding principle for safeguarded land identified for the plan period is that it is not available for general development and would be protected for the life of the plan as equivalent to designated Green Belt. Criteria in relation to the potential use of alternative sites would only arise where a proposal accorded with all of the previous criteria. Should development of alternative sites for development become unviable this issue would be addressed through the Local Plans approach to securing delivery expressed within the monitoring and implementation section. Any release of safeguarded land for | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | development in this context would be secured through a partial or full review of the Local Plan. | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152023 | Policy S3.1 The Green Belt is generally supported alongside policies DM3.2-4 for related uses. Having reviewed the Green Belt review however the final conclusion of this report is to ensure suitable flexibility that should any future monitoring within the plan process identify the exceptional circumstances for revisions to the Green Belt this would trigger the need for an early plan review process. This identified in paragraph 10.4 on page 47 of your report recommends 3 such example situations where this could happen: "ç A shortage of available, developable land for housing and employment purposes in order to meet the growth requirements set out in the local plan: "ç Significant encroachment into the parcel since original designation: and "ç Implications of further changes to Green Belt in neighbouring local authorities: These elements should be reflected in this policy and picked up in section 11 (Implementation and Monitoring) which is also mentioned later in this representation. | | DM 3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land | As highlighted through the Green Belt Review, there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries. The boundaries identified are considered to be permanent and able to endure beyond the plan period. However, it is acknowledged that this position needs to be reviewed throughout the plan period through appropriate monitoring indicators, any future amendment to the Green Belt and safeguarded land would have to be made through a review of the Local Plan. | Para added: "In line with national policy, any future amendments to the Green Belt and safeguarded land will be undertaken through review of the Local Plan." |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152142 | Policy DM3.4 - proposals to develop safeguarded land should be subject to the same test as development covered by paragraph 4.1 0. | | DM 3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land | An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and propose measures to address and mitigate any flood risk, in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site and, as part of this, the Council is working | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | closely with both Northumbrian Water and the Environment Agency. | |
| | | | | | | AS 3.5 Killingworth Open Break | It has been assessed that Killingworth Open Break would be a suitable Local Green Space. Local Green Space designation is similar to the Open Break designation that originated in the UDP 2002. | Policy amended to "Local Green Space at Killingworth Open Break" with wording changes to reflect the change in status. |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP20151043 | Killingworth Open Break. This is very welcomed for the open aspect and wild life corridor it brings. | | AS 3.5 Killingworth Open Break | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151330 | Policies S3:1 and DM3:2 Green Belt. CPRE strongly supports these policies. S3.1 could usefully include maintaining the openness of the countryside as an objective of Green Belt, in line with NPPF. CPRE particularly welcomes the decision reported in paragraph 4.61 not to propose any alterations to or deletions from the Green Belt. We also support Policy AS 3:5 Killingworth Open Break. | | AS 3.5 Killingworth Open Break | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805535 | | | LP20151562 | Killingworth Open Break. This is very welcome for the open aspect and wild life corridor it brings. Could we have another open break plus a re-designated wild life corridor between the housing estates that back on to Killingworth Lane (B1317) and the Proposed developments on K / Moor and Holystone, or redefine the open break(-the only reason the break is as defined on the map is because of the issues with Methane gas caused because of the filling in of the old tip, which again you cannot build on!). | | AS 3.5 Killingworth Open Break | Comments noted. The Killingworth Open Break was designated in the UDP due to the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of the Killingworth Village conservation area. It is proposed to designate it as a Local Green Space in the Local Plan. As part of the masterplanning associated with the potential development of Killingworth Moor, and as set out in the "Strategic Site Allocations" policy, the site will be subject to full assessment regarding green space provision and impact on landscape character. | No amendments proposed. |
| 473231 | | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151598 | Policy AS3.5 relates to the Killingworth Open Break and states that development within that area will not be permitted where it | | AS 3.5 Killingworth Open Break | Comments noted. The role and continue status of the Killingworth Open Break has been reviewed as part of this Local Plan | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | would adversely affect the open character of the area and the special setting of the Killingworth Village conservation area. As suggested above, the extent of the Open Break should be amended to enable a Preferred Housing Development Site whilst retaining a significant and more defensible break between Killingworth Village and the built up areas to the south. | | | process. The existing extent of the break is considered robust and necessary to maintain the overall sense of openness to safeguard the setting of Killingworth Village conservation area. As such no amendment is proposed to the already identified extent of the open break. It is proposed to be designated in the Local Plan as a Local Green Space. | |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151729 | 20. The importance of maintaining an open break between settlements to stop coalescence and protect the setting of heritage assets is acknowledged. The policy does, however, suggest a moratorium on development within this area without any assessment of the importance that various pieces of land within the open break make to these objectives or consideration of the sustainability credentials of such parcels of land. To justify the policy the HBF recommends that the Council undertake further work to ascertain the importance of the various land parcels which form the open break. | | AS 3.5 Killingworth Open Break | The Killingworth Open Break designation is a specific policy tool included in the UDP designed to protect the character of Killingworth Village and represents a relatively small area of the Borough as a whole. Further review of the break has been undertaken to further define its role and importance. It has been assessed that the open break be designated as a Local Green Space in line with NPPF guidance. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805556 | | | LP20151974 | Killingworth Open Break. This is very welcomed for the open aspect and wild life corridor it brings. Could we have another open break, wild life corridor between the housing estates that back on to Killingworth Lane (B1317) and the Proposed developments on K / Moor and Holystone. Running from the Seaton Burn waggon way wildlife corridor along the side of the B1317 road to the old R.E.M.E. site which has planning permission for Bellway housing. This would stop the merging of communities and retain a measure | | AS 3.5 Killingworth Open Break | Comments noted. The Killingworth Open Break was designated in the UDP due to the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of the Killingworth Village conservation area. It is proposed to be designated in the Local Plan as a Local Green Space. As part of the masterplanning associated with the potential development of Killingworth Moor, and as set out in the "Strategic Site Allocations" policy, the site will be subject to full assessment regarding green space provision and impact on | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | of green open space on the upper East side of Killingworth Moor, and fulfil objectives of AS7.4 (d.& e.) | | | landscape character. | |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152004 | Policy AS3.5 proposes to retain the Killingworth Open Break (from that set out in the North Tyneside UDP) principally to protect Killingworth Conservation Area. The consortium supports the retention of the settlement break in its current alignment but would object to any increase in its extent into the land identified as a strategic allocation at Killingworth Moor under Policy AS7.4. A master planning exercise will be undertaken by the consortium for the Killingworth Moor site with the Council and in line with Policy AS7.4. However, as set out in specific comments to AS7.4 below, the extent of any additional separation of existing built up areas should be determined through that masterplan and not within an expanded Settlement Break or defined on the proposals map. The consortium therefore supports the settlement break in its current form but would resist any eastwards expansion of the policy. | | AS 3.5 Killingworth Open Break | Comments noted. The Killingworth Open Break was designated in the UDP due to the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of the Killingworth Village conservation area. It is proposed to be designated in the Local Plan as a Local Green Space. As part of the masterplanning associated with the potential development of Killingworth Moor, and as set out in the "Strategic Site Allocations" policy, the site will be subject to full assessment regarding green space provision and impact on landscape character. Decisions on where any green space provision is proposed will be subject to full assessment and consultation with relevant stakeholders. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152143 | Policy AS3.5- English Heritage welcomes this policy. | | AS 3.5 Killingworth Open Break | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151331 | Policy S4:1. Neighbourhood Plans. CPRE supports this policy and is willing to advise communities that wish to establish Neighbourhood Plans. | | S 4.1 Supporting Neighbourhood Planning | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898630 | | | LP2015903 | I support any initiative to increase the skills of local people to help them into jobs. We do not need an influx of people into the borough that will turn it into one big housing estate | | Business support, skills, training | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | with unsightly industrial units, but we do need to support the people who already live here into long term employment. | | | positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151338 | Typo: para 5:42 reference should be to policy DM5.7 not DM5.6 | | Business support, skills, training | Comment noted. Wrong policy reference, this will be amended. | Para 5.42 new refers to policy DM5.7. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151332 | Para 5.7 notes that 50% of the residents of North Tyneside commute out of the Borough for work. Given that the Newcastle-Gateshead Plan has recently been approved with high housing provision partly stemming from a strategic commitment to house their growing workforce in their plan area, modelling for North Tyneside employment and housing needs is unlikely to follow past trends. It is not clear that this policy intervention has been taken into account. | | Economic Development | Comment noted. The numbers of jobs are based on the work of economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside (2015). This analyses many contributing factors but draws upon the economic forecasts from the North East Local Economic Partnership and has considered the relationship of jobs between North Tyneside and its neighbouring authorities including the employment Land Position Statement agreed in preparation of the NewcastleGateshead Local Plan. The Council have worked closely with its neighbouring authorities to ensure that planned growth across the authorities is complementary and the growth for North Tyneside would require a change not only in the level of migration from Newcastle to North Tyneside, but also in the proportion of residents living and working within North Tyneside. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805615 | Lambert Smith | PLANNING CONSULTAN | LP20151657 | Finally, it is worth reiterating that the Port has previously suggested that the emerging plan | | Economic Development | Comment noted. The potential for a specific Port of Tyne policy has been considered. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | Hampton | CY | | <p>include a standalone policy relating to its land holdings which could simplify the overall policy approach. The suggested wording is set out again below for ease of reference. This is as you are aware also something that has been discussed with South Tyneside's planning authority given the Port's land interests within its administrative area. The Port would welcome further discussions with the Council in this regard. Supporting the economic growth and prosperity of North Tyneside through the future development of the Port of Tyne on the north bank of the River Tyne to enable it to adapt and operate efficiently as a key strategic gateway to trade, including support for port related development and expansion for port-related uses. The Port of Tyne plays a significant role in the economic growth, investment and prosperity of North Tyneside, both directly and indirectly. The port benefits from "permitted development' rights to approve port related development on land in their ownership. However, it is recognised that as the Port continues to evolve it may wish to expand its port related activities onto newly acquired land. In the future it is also acknowledged that the Port, or its tenants, may come forward with proposals for industrial and business type uses that cannot be classed as port related development. The Council supports the development of the Port but will assess any proposals on their own merits as they come forward having regard to the more general policies in the plan that support advanced engineering, low carbon,</p> | | | <p>However, as is expressed within the comment here the Port benefits from permitted development rights for port related uses. The Council has expressed its support for the role of the Port and its importance for the economic prosperity of North Tyneside within the Local Plan. Proposals for development that fall outside of the permitted development rights of the Port are also actively supported through the wider economic development policies of the Local Plan. Re-emphasising this through an additional policy is not considered necessary and would not add materially to the future delivery of development on Port of Tyne land.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | renewable, marine and offshore technology, manufacturing and the oil and gas sectors. More generally, however, the Port welcomes the revisions made to the emerging plan to reflect its business operations in the Borough and requests that the amendments suggested above are also included to ensure consistency of approach. | | | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152144 | Paragraph 5.9- there is a grammatical error on the first line. | | Economic Development | Comment noted and paragraph amended. | Para 5.8 refers to the 'modelled requirements for Employment Land Provision' and para 5.9 first sentence now reads 'The Employment Land Review draws on views from the business sector.....' |
| 898630 | | | LP2015904 | No more out of town developments. Silverlink is hell. Hell to get into and out of (realistically only by car), hell to look at and dead at night. It's my last resort as a shopping destination and it's not a place to linger (and spend more) such as town and village centres. I'd rather go to Byker. | | Future edge and out of centre developments | Comments noted. As outlined in National Planning Policy, North Tyneside Local Plan follows a 'town centre first approach' but must accommodate the retail needs of the Borough. The Local Plan outlines the requirements any proposals for edge or centre or out of centre developments must meet in order to ensure no harm to the Borough's identified centres. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151763 | - Para. 6.64 doesn't say, even very approximately, how much future 'comparison' retail demand (or leisure and convenience retail) may not be able to be fully accommodated in North Tyneside's three largest town centres. - It is also not clear where predict | | Future edge and out of centre developments | Comment noted. Further detail on the occupancy and vacancy of town centres can be found in the Retail and Leisure Study (2014). The study it found that the total amount of vacant floorspace in the town centres would be able to accommodate the medium growth outcomes for future retail provision. However, the size of retail floorspace available is predominantly small units (95% of those available have a gross floorspace less than 300sqm). It is crucial for | Additional detail added into the supporting text and Policy S3.3. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | the Council to support the existing town centres to attract future investment and it is hoped through the recent investment by the Council and the owners of the Beacon Shopping Centre in North Shields and The Forum in Wallsend this will lead to greater occupancy levels and a greater variety of town centre floorspace, leading to more town centre businesses moving in. | |
| 396421 | Station Developments | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20151778 | <p>On behalf of Station Development Ltd (Respondent ID: 396421) representations are made to the North Tyneside Local Plan-Consultation 2015 and supporting documents relevant to the preparation of the Local Plan. The comments in this letter follow representations made to the Local Plan Consultant 2013 by Station Developments Ltd in respect of Tynemouth Station and the council's response to those comments at Comment Reference: LPCD4418 and LPCD4425. Previous representations In summary, the representations to the Consultation 2013 stated the council should allocate the eastern concourse area of the station for retail development in line with planning permission and listed building consent secured via appeal in February 2011. Furthermore, the 'pod' type units on the western concourse, whilst not included in the appeal decision, are vacant and given their size should be allocated for a range of uses (A1, A2, A3, D1 and D2) to assist in bringing the units back into viable economic use. As the station is within the designated district centre boundary of Tynemouth, the council stated: "it is not considered necessary to</p> | | Future edge and out of centre developments | Comment noted. Tynemouth Station now recognised as floorspace that contributes to the overall retail need of the Local Plan in Policy. | Additional sites in town centres allocated for retail development are highlighted in Policy S3.3. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>identify the site for retail use but that it would be supported for town centre uses as with any other appropriate site within the town centre boundary."Representations to Consultation 2015 Station Developments Ltd continue to support the designation of Tynemouth as a district centre and inclusion of the station site within the defined boundary. The planning appeal decision permitted a range of uses within Use Classes A1 and D1 throughout the station bringing community benefit including retail units, a heritage centre, photographic society, community meeting rooms, public library and station manager's office with associated storage. The benefit of th is permission should not be lost as the station contributes significantly to the vitality and viability of Tynemouth particularly through the arts, culture and market programme. The market attracts many thousands of visitors to Tynemouth who spend time and money throughout the centre. The development potential at the station site will enhance the station further for community benefit. It is considered therefore in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that the eastern concourse area of the station should be allocated for retail development to reflect the planning permission. The NPPF states clearly that local planning authorities should allocate sites in town centres to ensure a sufficient supply of suitable sites. The planning permission demonstrates the site is suitable, available and deliverable for retail use. The council's reliance on the site</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>being within the defined centre boundary is not sufficient and does not accord with the NPPF in that it does not demonstrate the plan is sound i.e. positively prepared, justified and consistent with national policy. In order to remedy the situation and for the plan to be sound, the site should be allocated with reference to the following paragraphs of the NPPF: ~ At paragraph 17, the core planning principles underpinning planning states: plans should set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area; the effective use of land should be encouraged by reusing land that has been previously developed; and mixed use developments should be promoted, and multiple benefits from the use of land encouraged. ~ Paragraph 23 states local authorities should allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, along with other town centre uses, in town centres. It is important development is not compromised by limited site availability and local authorities should ensure a sufficient supply of suitable sites. ~ Paragraph 70 states planning policies should plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities, such as local shops, to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments. ~ Paragraph 157 is clear in stating, crucially, Local Plans should allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land. The Retail and Leisure Study (2014) as the evidence base supporting the Consultation Plan is clear at paragraph 7.28 in concluding the council should identify</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>retail opportunities in town centres and edge of centre before out of centre locations are considered. Indeed, this is crucial given a large proportion of retail spending occurs outside the Borough and Policy 56.3 specially seeks to increase the retention of expenditure currently leaking out to ensure centres remain vital and viable. This applies to Tynemouth district centre where the allocation of the station site will support the council's strategy. Investment decisions require a degree of certainty to proceed, with developers I occupiers citing planning as a high risk, and one which prevents investment from happening unless that certainty exists. Allocation of the site will provide certainty and attract investment. Conclusion The council should in accordance with national policy and the conclusions of the Retail and Leisure Study (2014) allocate the eastern concourse area of the Tynemouth Station site, approved by an appeal decision, for retail use to ensure the Local Plan is sound, in that it is positively prepared, justified and consistent with national policy.</p> | | | | |
| 797386 | | | LP20151051 | <p>For all the four main centres, there is a problem of sprawl, i.e. the shops and other retail outlets are too spread out . It may be worth setting up a group to see if shops on the outskirts of the main streets can be persuaded to move into vacant units closer in, so that shoppers can more easily see what's on offer. In North Shields, there is a need for the centre to leverage off the great recent success of the Fish Quay. But there is no easy transport connection between the two. For all</p> | | Future retail demands and requirements | <p>Comments noted. The relocation of retail outlets within the town centre is not something that can be enforced through planning policy however DM6.4 (now DM3.5) sets out a number of development requirements which seeks to support retail development and investment in the retail core. AS1.3 (now AS8.11) states that within the North Shields Priority Investment and Regeneration Area... (c) opportunities should be taken to improve pedestrian and</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | centres, it is essential that the parking be made easier and cheaper. Instead of earning money from parking, reduce the cost and enable residents and visitors to spend money in shops, cafes, bars etc. | | | vehicular links from North Shields Town Centre to the riverside and in particular with the Fish Quay. In the same instance parking is not fall under the control of Planning Policy. | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151758 | Para. 6.28 Support approach to concentration of Primary Shopping Areas (I think condensing or concentration is a better word than "strengthening" in 6.28). | | Retail and housing development within town centres | Comments noted. The term 'strengthening' is used to reflect the recommendations outlined in the Retail and Leisure Study 2015. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151759 | Para.6.32 Object. First sentence seems to conflict with 6.28. It seems to be promoting non-retail in the primary frontage that is to be condensed when keeping a concentrated retail core should be the aim. Second sentence of 6.32 is the wrong way around: why let something stable be upset? It should be quite possible to predict the likely potential consequences of "significant recent shifts": planners are usually good at this. A change can unbalance something which has been stable. Whereas changes where there have been recent shifts might not do any such damage. A shifting and changing area could more easily accept or accommodate further changes. | | Retail and housing development within town centres | Comment noted. Paragraph will be re-worded to clarify the position regarding retail within the primary shopping frontages and retaining a strong retail core within the Boroughs town centres. | Para 6.32, Para 6.33 and Para 6.34 incorporated into new Para 6.41 and new Para 6.42 |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151762 | - Opportunities for town centre regeneration need to be identified in a spatial way on plans. At least by Star symbols on the North Shields inset plan with a list of opportunities in accompanying local plan text. - Its not just sites that need to be identified | | Retail and housing development within town centres | Comment noted. The Council will provide a more detailed analysis of town centre opportunity sites within the next stage of the Plan preparation and accompanying evidence | Provide provide a more detailed analysis of town centre opportunity sites within the next stage of the Plan |
| 898969 | | | LP20151000 | The council needs to address the issue of waste management from retail operations. Retail parks and the public highways surrounding them are blighted by litter and | | Retail and Town Centres | Comments noted. When assessing retail applications, the Council are mindful of ensuring that there is adequate refuse facilities available in order to provide for the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | packaging waste. Retail facilities must have stricter waste controls placed upon them, which are then enforced. | | | <p>needs of the new unit. Generally speaking the Council would normally insist upon the following condition;</p> <p>'No development shall take place until details of facilities to be provided for the storage of refuse at the premises have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities which should also include the provision of wheeled refuse bins shall be provided in accordance with the approved details, prior to the occupation of any part of the development and thereafter permanently retained.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of the area having regard to policy H13 of the North Tyneside Unitary Development Plan 2002.'</p> <p>This is primarily to ensure that refuse facilities are provided and that they can be adequately stored on the site and easily accessed by suitable refuse lorries. The Council wants to avoid the need for bins to be stored permanently on the public highway, which would be unsightly. The aim is that by providing adequate refuse facilities, it will ensure that waste is disposed of properly and avoid littering. Clearly, ultimately it is the responsibility of the operator of the retail unit to ensure that they dispose of their rubbish properly and to avoid littering. Planning powers do exist under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for local planning authorities in certain circumstances to take</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | steps requiring land to be cleaned up, when it's condition adversely affect the amenity of the area. If you are particularly concerned regarding a particular area, then please make contact with the Council Planning Enforcement Team who will investigate further http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-sub-cat.shtml?p_subjectCategory=33 . | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151340 | CPRE welcomes the focus on town centres and the restrictions on out of town shopping centres. | | Retail and Town Centres | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805689 | | | LP2015892 | All of our region's town centres are impacted negatively by masses of litter and ugly shop signage. Why were/are shops given planning permission for such gaudy and cheap looking signage? My heart sinks when I look at what has happened to the area in the last 30 years. In Whitley Bay, Park View appears to be finally on the up with some lovely little shops and cafes, but Whitley Road and the centre itself looks dirty and tacky. Walking from West Monkseaton into Whitley Bay centre, I see litter every step of the way. Why are commercial premises not cleaning up outside their properties? If each one of them spent five minutes each morning to pick up litter - what a huge difference could be made very quickly. No amount of flower displays and street furniture is going to improve the look and feel of the area if we (and I recognise 'we' means residents, businesses, schools, hospitals etc. - not just council staff) don't tackle the fundamental issue of our lovely North Tyneside looking like one giant landfill site. | | Supporting competitive town centres | Comments noted. With regards to shop frontages, much shopfront work does not require planning permission and therefore out of our control. However, in recognising the issue, the Local Plan does include policies that aim to ensure good quality shop fronts in those occasions where planning permission is required. With regards to litter, the Planning system primarily deals with the built environment. The Local Plan contains a policy to ensure that new developments provide sustainable waste management (during construction and use) through the provision of recycling facilities and ensure a suitable location for the storage and collection of waste (policy DM7.9 New Development and Waste). However, the Local Plan or Planning system are otherwise not able to manage litter. The Council have a Streetcare team who deal with litter issues and they are aware of your concerns. Residents are encouraged to report issues by calling the team or via an online form: | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/403/report-untidy-streets-and-overflowing-litter-bins | |
| 892444 | | RESIDENT | LP2015258 | We need 'green' industries on the river and high tech firms. Whilst eroding more greenfield sites, we let villages like Willington Quay and East Howdon put up with sub-standard housing and facilities and residents having to ensure environmental pollution, smells and noise. No problem with OGN and employing many on the Tyne but scrap yards and sewage firms do not employ many and are toxic. | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | The Local Plan supports the regeneration of the riverside for employment purposes and Policy AS1.2 (now 8.1)'The Wallsend and Willington Quay Sub Area' supports the north bank of the Tyne as a focus for advanced engineering, research and development particularly in renewable and marine off-shore manufacturing and sub sea technologies. Policy AS1.2 (now 8.1) also states that within the Wallsend and Willington Quay sub area there will be an increase the overall quality and supply of housing; improve the public realm and management of specific housing areas; improve provision of new community facilities and services, including health services and reduce the impact of intrusive employment uses upon residential amenity in the area. The Local Plan recognises the importance that the former shipyards on Tyne offer for future investment in port related activities and Policy AS5.5 (now 2.5) 'River Tyne North Bank' states that economic development should not restrict riverside access that could compromise the capacity of North Bank to support marine and off-shore related industry. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805724 | | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015273 | Support expressed generally for the policy and in particular the inclusion of tourism as a form of economic development. | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894730 | | RESIDENT | LP2015444 | Business rates should be less to increase business. | | S 5.1 Economic | Comment noted. The Local Plan does control the level at which business rates are | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | Growth Strategy | set, the multiplier is set by central government. | |
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015467 | We note North Tyneside's strategic aspirations and updated assessed needs for growth in policies S5.1-5.2, S6.1-6.3 and S7.1 (now S4.1)-7.2 plus DM7.6 | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151097 | Green Party Nowhere in this section is there is any mention of agriculture or related economic activity. And yet there are several farms and a considerable amount of agricultural land and activity in the borough. Land under cultivation is not just in the Green Belt, but also in much of the green sites earmarked for development e.g. Killingworth Moor and Murton. There is opportunity here for the Borough to develop a food-growing economy which could provide fresh fruit and vegetables to the local hospital, schools, residential homes etc; recycle food waste with an anaerobic digester which could also provide heat for greenhouse produce; and provide resources for schools relating to food growing and preparation. The land hubs could also support urban food growing schemes in schools, gardens and backyards etc (there are an increasing number of such schemes such as that in Middlesbrough). | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Comment noted. Although agricultural land forms part of the landscape within North Tyneside its economic importance is not forecast to be a significant sector of the Boroughs future economy. The Local Plan cannot control the procurement of locally grown food to local hospitals, schools, residential homes etc. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary, thereby ensuring no pressure for future development is placed on agricultural land within the green belt. Further evidence on the agricultural land classification for North Tyneside has been requested from Natural England to help determine the importance of the agricultural land within the Borough. Within the two large areas of development at Murton and Killingworth Moor Policy AS7.4 (now 4.4 a-c) outlines that further comprehensive master planning will be required. This includes the importance of providing a green space strategy, which could include future provision of allotments to encourage local food production. The Local Plan advocates the minimisation of waste production and the re-use and recovery of waste materials e.g. recycling, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | composting and energy from waste recovery (Policy S10.11 now S7.7) but there are currently no proposals for an anaerobic digester within the Plan. | |
| 899459 | | | LP20151286 | The selected growth option of High is not consistent with the response to the 2013 plan consultation where 84% of respondents stated that they wanted lower growth options. The difference in housing numbers required between the low (community response favoured) and high growth models is approximately 5000 homes - the same as the number of homes outlined for the two development sites at Killingworth and Murton. North Tyneside does not need more housing, and particularly not executive style high value housing which will typically be built by the developers who own the plots in question. | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The evidence produced from independent consultants on levels of growth in North Tyneside and the reality of recent planning appeals at places such as Scaffold Hill near Holystone, Whitehouse Farm, near West Moor and Station Road at Wallsend have all reinforced the need for the Council to bring forward additional sites to meet the levels of growth being forecast. This is a recommendation from national government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework. Through the Local Plan the Council intends to develop a Plan led approach to future growth so the issues of new development (such as affordable housing and executive housing) can be considered together to deliver the best possible solutions. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151333 | Policy S5:1. Economic Growth Strategy. CPRE can support this policy, given the restraints on development imposed by the decision on the Green Belt. The value of the Metro in providing workforce mobility should be explicitly recognised in the policy. | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Comment noted. The value of the Metro and encouraging sustainable access is recognised in Policy S5.2 (now 2.2), S1.1 and following comments received further emphasised in Policy DM5.4 (now 2.4). | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| 899323 | | | LP20151594 | As per our previous representations, submitted in January 2014, NewRiver Retail agrees that retail and leisure development have a role in facilitating economic growth and generally supports Policy S5.1 which seeks to "Attract a range of innovative and creative businesses to retail, leisure and office development within the Borough's town centres" . Notwithstanding that, our Client is concerned that the Policy contains a new reference to "other sustainable locations" may facilitate retail and leisure development to out-of-town locations, what would have a harmful effect on the town centres. NewRiver Retail considers that the reference "and other sustainable locations" should be removed in order to fully comply with the "town centre first' approach set out in the NPPF. | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Comment noted. Reference to 'other sustainable locations' will be removed to support town centres first and the Councils objective to revitalise its town centres. Development that cannot be accommodated within a town centre would need to be considered by policies for town centre development in edge or out of centre locations. | Remove reference to 'and other sustainable locations' from Criteria (a) (i) |
| 805615 | Lambert Smith Hampton | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151653 | The introduction of the words "Port related activity and manufacturing' at criteria b) of Policy S5.1 "Economic Growth Strategy' is welcomed as it introduces support to traditional port related activity and B2 and B8 uses within the overarching policy. The introduction of this wording is critical to the future role of the Port, including its estates work leasing buildings and land to a number of general business and industrial operations. The Port also remains supportive of the focus of new marine and renewable sectors on its land. However, this should not be to the detriment of other traditional businesses and activities and it is considered that the rewording of the policy addresses this. | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151937 | Natural England would encourage a reference to policy DM8.6 in relation to this policy to | | S 5.1 Economic | Comment noted. Reference will be added. | "This policy has been identified as having the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | ensure that it is compliant with the Habitats Regulations as it supports "the creation, enhancement and expansion of tourist attractions, visitor accommodation and infrastructure, capitalising on the Borough's exceptional North Sea coast" and so there is potential for an impact on Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar. Although it is understood that there are other more specific policies elsewhere, referencing DM8.6 would ensure consistency with these policies. | | Growth Strategy | | potential to cause adverse impacts on internationally protected wildlife sites. When implemented, regard should be had to policy DM8.6 that sets out the requirement for appropriate avoidance or mitigation of, or compensation for, any adverse effects." has been added at 5.19. This policy is now 5.6. |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152005 | Policy S5.1 sets out the economic growth strategy for the plan period which the consortium broadly support whilst maintaining the right to undertake a further assessment of the quantum of land and sites identified for employment use under Policy S5.2. The consortium specifically supports recognition of the need for new office and business investment including national scale office development and the importance of the A19 corridor. Policy S5.1 " Economic Growth Strategy In commenting on the Economic Growth Strategy, the consortium has considered the Employment Land Review 2014 (" ELR") and the content of the Local Plan. The consortium has not undertaken its own detailed assessment of the ELR or of the sites identified to be available for employment use for the plan period. They do, however, reserve the right to do so. Notwithstanding this, the consortium broadly supports the identification of 146 hectares of available employment land for the plan period | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Comment noted. The Employment Land Review (ELR) was undertaken in 2014 and covers the period of the Local Plan to 2032. The ELR provides a basis for an employment land trajectory for the next 18 years, covering the time taken for the Local Plan to be adopted (2017) and then 15 years thereafter. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>(15 years) based on the evidence set out in the ELR. The employment land supply is set out in the Local Plan for the period of 2014 "“ 2032 (18 years) yet that does not align with the plan period set out in paragraph 3.1 of the local plan which suggests a 15 year period between adoption (circa 2016/17) and 2032. Based on a 15 year plan period the supply of 146 ha would equate to approximately 10 ha per annum which is in line with historic average land take up. It is noted that a further 36 hectares of reserved land is also available for the plan period, on top of the 146 ha of available land identified. Part of the 146 ha of supply is a single new allocation of employment land for 17 ha at Killingworth Moor (Site 26). This land falls within the consortium's control and is supported for inclusion in a masterplan to be prepared by the consortium in agreement with the Council. The location of employment land within the wider Killingworth Moor allocation under Policy AS7.4 is proposed to lie within easy proximity and access to the A19 but will be established within the agreed masterplan and is subject to ongoing assessment and evaluation of the site and surroundings. The consortium supports the allocation but reserves the right to identify a preferred location (within Killingworth Moor) and also an alteration to the overall quantum of employment subject to the outcome of the ongoing masterplanning of the site. In principle the consortium supports the location of the new employment at Killingworth Moor as it represents a strategically important</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>location as an expansion to the A19 economic corridor (as shown on the proposals map) and is also well related for access not only onto the A19 but also to Northumberland Park Metro via a link under the A19. In particular, Killingworth Moor offers the opportunity to provide a large scale site of strategic significance, adding to both the quality and quantity of employment land in the Borough. Well related to Cobalt, it represents a deliverable employment site in the plan period and at this stage a flexible employment allocation including B1, B2 and B8 uses should be applied, subject to any development being compatible with adjoining proposed housing. This will increase employment opportunities and retain more residents of the Borough also working in North Tyneside. As a major investor and developer within North Tyneside the Northumberland Estates is committed to delivery of the employment land within the plan period. It is noted from the ELR that a significant proportion of future demand for employment land will be for B1 uses, particularly B1 (a) offices. Given the successes of Cobalt and Quorum in delivering new B1 (a) office space the ELR identifies a need for further land for this use. The consortium considers that whilst not expressly stated within Policy S5.1, that the land at Killingworth Moor should be identified for B1(a) led development but that it should not be restricted only to that use and should include the potential for a range of business uses and some ancillary and complementary retail and potential small scale leisure uses.</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| 901136 | | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20152062 | <p>As part of the evidence base to inform the North Tyneside Local Plan consultation , North Tyneside has published a Employment Land Review (ELR) which has been aligned with the targets of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). The ELR acknowledges that the Cobalt and Quorum Business Parks will become occupied as job growth increases. This accords with Newcastle's ELR which acknowledges that our under supply of employment land in the short term could be accommodated in North Tyneside at Cobalt and Quorum Business Parks. The job growth forecasts in North Tyneside's ELR and focus on the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) for the North East LEP is considered to be an acceptable position, planning for a medium growth scenario of 707 jobs per annum. North Tyneside's previous ELR identified 210ha of available employment land, this up to date position in the ELR recommends at least 146ha general employment land, an average of 8ha per year 2014 to 2032. A further 36ha of reserved land, that is controlled by existing businesses on site and available solely as potential expansion land, is also recognised. Newcastle support North Tyneside's position that jobs growth will be in B-use class along the river facilitated by the Low Carbon Enterprise Zone. This approach reflects Newcastle's allocation of Walker Riverside as a Key Employment Area in The Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle (CSUCP). Walker Riverside has Enterprise Zone status and the riverside can accommodate a cluster of engineering and environmental</p> | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | technologies which benefit from locating in close proximity to similar companies and suppliers. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152095 | RE New Site: Land to rear of Front Street, Seaton Burn. Our client acknowledges and supports Policy S5.1 d)i), which recognises the potential for major logistics facilities for goods and materials on sites which take advantage of the Borough's excellent road connections. Policy S5.1 c)v. recognises the potential for office and business investment development in the A19 (T) economic corridor. This corridor is defined on the Policies Map and does not include our Client's site at Seaton Burn. It is considered that there are other locations, such as our Client's site, which are appropriate for office and business development investment and therefore, in this context, it is recommended that the policy is amended as follows: "support investment opportunities for regional and national scale office, research and development and manufacturing in the A19 (T) economic corridor which includes the former Enterprise Zone area and other locations which can take advantage of the Borough's excellent national and international transport connections by road, rail, air and port connections" [NLP emphasis]. Under the above policy context, it is considered that the development of our Client's site adjacent to the A1/A19 junction would deliver sustainable economic growth as sought by this Policy S5.1. | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. Having considered the extent of development required to 2032 there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current Plan period without requiring a further review of the Green Belt. It is therefore concluded that there are no exceptional circumstances to consider development within the Green Belt. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152148 | Policy S5.1 - English Heritage welcomes acknowledgement that Segedunum and other | | S 5.1 Economic | Comments noted, an amendment will be made to the supporting text to acknowledge | "Much of the Borough's heritage assets have |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | heritage assets are important in terms of economic growth. This being the case it is disappointing that apart from a passing reference to the World Heritage Site there is no accompanying commentary in this chapter explaining how the historic environment will be positively utilised as a driver for economic progress. This is somewhat at odds with the clear interconnection described in paragraph 9.50. | | Growth Strategy | the role of the historic environment to the Borough's economy. | significant potential to contribute to the economy of the area through, for example, being part of regeneration schemes or attracting visitors." has been added to para 5.11 (now para 5.13) |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152148 | Development should only be allowed where it does not cause unjustified harm to, or loss of, the significance of any heritage assets. Even 'less than substantial' harm is unacceptable if it cannot be outweighed by public benefits. Paragraph 5.17- development at the former shipyards has the potential to affect both designated and non-designated heritage assets and should be planned with this in mind. | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Comments noted. "Development should be of an appropriate scale and be located where the environment and infrastructure can accommodate the visitor impact without significant adverse impact." was included in the policy to take into account the potential impact that economic growth could have on the natural environment and the area's infrastructure. We agree that it appeared to refer to the historic environment and its inclusion was unclear. It should be removed to avoid confusion and we believe that issues concerning the natural environment, the historic environment and infrastructure are covered adequately in their respective chapters/policies to be applied across the Plan's proposals. Comments regarding shipyards are noted - the Plan's heritage policies will be applied to development effecting the shipyards. | "Development should be of an appropriate scale and be located where the environment and infrastructure can accommodate the visitor impact without significant adverse impact." removed from criterion aiii. |
| 901309 | Council for British Archaeology North | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152208 | We are pleased to see the presence of the Built Environment and Archaeological Remains within several of the key objectives of this local plan, and indeed it is given such prominence in S5.1a.iii within Retail, Leisure | | S 5.1 Economic Growth Strategy | Comments noted | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | and Tourism. | | | | |
| 396697 | | RESIDENT | LP201570 | I think these are really good plans to bring jobs into the area. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP201581 | Site 106: NT001 Tyne Tunnel Trading Estate, High Flatworth. The traffic congestion here is staggering. It can take 20 mins just to drive down High Flatworth to get out of the Tyne Tunnel Trading Estate. You need to stop development in this area until the infrastructure is sorted: - Traffic lights on the roundabout at the South end of the TTTE. - Open the bus road so that cars can go North onto the Silverlink at peak times. - Get the Metro running from Northumberland Park to Percy Main with a station at the North end of High Flatworth. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Plan recognises the importance of delivering targeted improvements to the road network that contribute to the economic development and regeneration of North Tyneside in order to support businesses, improve safety and environmental quality and minimise congestion (Policy S10.3) (now S7.3). The comments will be passed on to the Highway Network Manager. The support for the potential Metro extension of the Cobalt Corridor Link (Policy S10.3) (now S7.3) is noted. | Information passed on to Highways Network Manager |
| 890384 | | RESIDENT | LP2015149 | Site NT055: The land between Salters Lane and Gosforth Park Way, borders Gosforth Nature reserve. This piece of land is a haven to wildlife, deer, herons, foxes wild birds including partridges who are building nests in the long grass, a sparrowhawk that hunts there, also silver birch and oak trees. Allowing building on this land, when there are other suitable sites is simply wrong, children need to see wildlife in its natural habitat and not on organised, structured areas, so please take in to consideration the devastation to the wildlife who live there, and the children in the area. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The site is suggested for employment land in the Local Plan and is not a designated wildlife site. However it is within close proximity to Gosforth Park which is a SSSI and further understanding of potential impact on protected species or valuable habitat will be considered as the Local Plan progresses. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890384 | | RESIDENT | LP2015179 | Site NT057: I would like nothing built on Number 10. It is across the road from | | S 5.2 Provision of | Comment noted. The site is suggested for employment land in the Local Plan and is | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | Gosforth Nature Reserve and it has a variety of wildlife on - deer, herons, partridges, wild birds and a sparrow hawk. I would like it left wild, for the creatures who inhabit it. This piece of land has a diverse array of wildlife including silverbirch trees, oak trees, pine trees and in the summer wild orchids grow on it. There is a vast amount of wild birds, various tits, partridges build nests in the field, foxes live on it. It is a wonderful piece of wild land that needs to be left wild. There are other areas around it that can be used for building on. I ask that any planning permission is refused and it is left for the wildlife. | | Land for Employment Development | not a designated wildlife site. However it is within close proximity to Gosforth Park which is a SSSI and further understanding of potential impact on protected species or valuable habitat will be considered as the Local Plan progresses. | |
| 890920 | | RESIDENT | LP2015184 | I think that the development of employment sites has to come with a guarantee that it is long-term, sustainable employment that utilises the sites. Too often in the past, sites have sprung up only for them to close in just a few years and for them to become derelict. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Plan draws upon the evidence of the Employment Land Review (2015), which outlines the level of economic growth over the next 15years. It is incredibly difficult to predict the economy over a 15 year time frame but it is a requirement of the Local Plan to plan for the level of growth that is intended over this period. The evidence suggests that North Tyneside needs to allocate land for the employment growth predicted, but the take up and success of this land for employment purposes will ultimately be decided by market forces. The role of the Local Plan is to ensure that the land is available, deliverable and viable to be brought forward for development during the course of the Plan. | No amendments proposed. |
| 891068 | | RESIDENT | LP2015195 | NT053: support development of this site (108 Esso) - keeping our green open land. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | Development | | |
| 891068 | | RESIDENT | LP2015196 | NT058: support development of this site (109 Weetslade) - keeping our green open land. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 891827 | | RESIDENT | LP2015203 | Where are all these jobs coming from? The building trade? | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | The numbers of jobs are based on the work of specialist economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside (2015). This analyses many contributing factors but draws upon the economic forecasts from the North East Local Economic Partnership. The ELR seeks to provide a broad coverage of all economic sectors, whilst also looking at some specific economic markets and sectors that are of particular significance to the Borough, such as marine technology and engineering as noted in the Councils 'Our North Tyneside Plan 2014-18'. | No amendments proposed. |
| 468309 | | RESIDENT | LP2015238 | I think employment will grow larger than indicated | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The numbers of jobs are based on the work of specialist economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside (2015). This analyses many contributing factors but draws upon the economic forecasts from the North East Local Economic Partnership. | No amendments proposed. |
| 892185 | Broadoak Asset Management | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015249 | Broadoak Asset Management acts on behalf of various investors in North Tyneside, and more specifically in relation to Quorum Business Park on Benton Lane. Since 2009 we have attracted 15 new businesses to North Tyneside bringing approx. 5,000 new jobs. Successes have included significant inward | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | investment projects including Tesco Bank, Balfour Beatty and Cofely. To maintain this track record of attracting job creating projects, it is of critical importance to have a long term supply of available and developable land in the right locations. We therefore fully support the North Tyneside Business and Economic Development team, and the Council's policy of retaining sufficient allocation of employment land to allow economic development to continue into the future. We particularly welcome the employment allocation of land immediately to the North and East of Quorum Business Park on Benton Lane. It is hugely important to retain sufficient employment land in North Tyneside, particularly those sites close to existing amenities and public transport connectivity, such as Quorum. | | | | |
| 892185 | Broadoak Asset Management | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015250 | NT031: We particularly welcome the employment allocation of the land immediately to the North and East of Quorum Business Park on Benton Lane. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 892836 | | RESIDENT | LP2015292 | The Local Plan Consultation 2015 is not evidence of the need for employment and new homes. Restrict the new employment to a level which can be accommodated by residents of North Tyneside "" we do not need to bring more people here. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The numbers of jobs are based on the work of economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside (2015). This analyses many contributing factors but draws upon the economic forecasts from the North East Local Economic Partnership. The numbers of new homes are based on the evidence compiled by a team of consultants who looked at various data sources such as Office for National Statistics. The Local Plan seeks to provide employment | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | and housing opportunities in the Borough that would reduce the need for of those who live in the Borough to commute out for work (currently 50%). | |
| | | | LP2015295 | Do an audit of empty factory and office premises before any more are built. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Employment Land Review (ELR) was recently updated (2015) and forms an important part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. The ELR considers previous take up rates of employment land from an annual monitoring survey, which records how much is available, and how much has been taken up. The ELR also considers the market perception of the Borough and market signals to reflect which areas of employment land are likely to see future demand in occupancy or investment. All these factors are considered in the future provision of employment land in the Local Plan. | No amendments proposed. |
| 892866 | | RESIDENT | LP2015300 | There are already many businesses empty in the area. Why build new houses to say it's for economic growth of the area when money should be spent filling empty premises not letting them become derelict then building more! | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Employment Land Review (ELR) was recently updated (2015) and forms an important part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. The ELR considers previous take up rates of employment land from an annual monitoring survey, which records how much is available, and how much has been taken up. The ELR also considers the market perception of the Borough and market signals to reflect which areas of employment land are likely to see future demand in occupancy or investment. All these factors are considered in the future provision of employment land in the Local Plan so that it is able to accommodate future investment. The numbers of homes to be needed during the course of the Local | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Plan are not just determined by economic growth but also population projections and migration trends. The Local Plan does account for some potential conversion of employment land to new homes around Killingworth Industrial Estate, West Chirton, Backworth, Whitley Bay and the Fish Quay. | |
| 892874 | | RESIDENT | LP2015302 | Continue to provide more employment opportunities | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | North Tyneside's Local Plan outlines opportunities for new employment land provision which will help encourage more jobs within the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893274 | | RESIDENT | LP2015326 | Which businesses are expected to provide employment of a social nature? To date, I'm not impressed by the outcomes provided by North Tyneside Partnerships! | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | The Local Plan encourages a strong local economy which excellent job opportunities for everyone. It does not specify which businesses will be based in the Borough as this is a more detailed issue that is not required of the Local Plan. | No amendments proposed. |
| 814591 | | | LP2015344 | It's all very well building swanky new offices but as a casual observer, aren't there quite a few empty office blocks that should be in use before more are built? | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The Employment Land Review (2015) considered the existing facilities and the future supply over the next 15years. Planning for the expected growth in North Tyneside based on the evidence indicates further land needs to be allocated to allow for this economic growth. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893847 | | | LP2015354 | Site NT058: I object to the development around Sandy Lane (site 109) for employment use. This site should not be developed until a Sandy Lane bypass is constructed. The proposed transport Improvements to Sandy Lane are not enough to solve the current traffic problems. Traffic lights would only | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan setting out future land allocations and policies that will guide planning decisions. The independent Employment Land Review (2015) was produced by a team of specialists who considered the existing | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | make congestion worse. With the abundance of empty units and employment land at Balliol, Gosforth, Annitsford and Cobalt business parks, to name a few sites, I question whether development of this site for employment is necessary. | | | employment land and how much is required over the next 15 years to meet the levels of growth. The suggested sites in the consultation make provision for this predicted provision. The sites for housing and employment use have been considered in the transport modelling work for North Tyneside and have helped secure around £150million highways funding, which will make it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. National planning policy requires LPAs to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife and the Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Wildlife corridor designation does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. | |
| 894270 | | RESIDENT | LP2015388 | We wish to register our concern about the amount of green field land being given over to industrial use in North Tyneside. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. | |
| 894375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015395 | Site 11 now Site E010: Although it would appear to be too late to save some of the green fields stretching along Whitley Road from Asda to Darsley Park I object to any further development on the fields that have not already been given full planning permission. All these fields should have been considered as, and indeed are shown on the map as a natural wildlife corridor /extension of the Rising Sun Country Park ,an area which was created for that very purpose by North Tyneside Council. A success story that they themselves herald and advertise as one of the "Jewels in the Crown" of North Tyneside ,and yet now seem to be restricting in its natural wildlife benefits. If these fields are built on then there will not be any effective "buffer zone " between existing communities such as Benton and Wallsend. The volume of traffic existing on Whitley Road is already more than it can cope with without further residential development. If any land should be given over to residential development then it should be the area covered by the ramshackle collection of so called industrial units known as the "Trembles Garage" industrial site on Whitley Road. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. The Trembles Yard site contributes towards the overall employment land provision and if this were to be built for housing another area of land would be required to meet future employment land needs. Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015396 | Site 19: Although it would appear to be too late to save some of the green fields stretching along Whitley Road from Asda to Darsley Park I object to any further development on the fields that have not already been given full planning permission. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | All these fields should have been considered as, and indeed are shown on the map as a natural wildlife corridor /extension of the Rising Sun Country Park ,an area which was created for that very purpose by North Tyneside Council. A success story that they themselves herald and advertise as one of the "Jewels in the Crown" of North Tyneside ,and yet now seem to be restricting in its natural wildlife benefits. If these fields are built on then there will not be any effective "buffer zone " between existing communities such as Benton and Wallsend. The volume of traffic existing on Whitley Road is already more than it can cope with without further residential development. If any land should be given over to residential development then it should be the area covered by the ramshackle collection of so called industrial units known as the "Trembles Garage" industrial site on Whitley Road. | | | is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. The Trembles Yard site contributes towards the overall employment land provision and if this were to be built for housing another area of land would be required to meet future employment land needs. Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | |
| 894375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015397 | Site 20: Although it would appear to be too late to save some of the green fields stretching along Whitley Road from Asda to Darsley Park I object to any further development on the fields that have not already been given full planning permission. All these fields should have been considered as, and indeed are shown on the map as a natural wildlife corridor /extension of the Rising Sun Country Park ,an area which was created for that very purpose by North Tyneside Council. A success story that they themselves herald and advertise as one of the "Jewels in the Crown" of North Tyneside ,and yet now seem to be restricting in its natural | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. The Trembles Yard site contributes towards the overall employment land provision and if | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | wildlife benefits. If these fields are built on then there will not be any effective "buffer zone " between existing communities such as Benton and Wallsend. The volume of traffic existing on Whitley Road is already more than it can cope with without further residential development. If any land should be given over to residential development then it should be the area covered by the ramshackle collection of so called industrial units known as the "Trembles Garage" industrial site on Whitley Road. | | | this were to built for housing another area of land would be required to meet future employment land needs. Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | |
| 894718 | | RESIDENT | LP2015437 | Create more jobs - employment via regeneration - North West, Cobalt and Whitley Bay should be number one priority | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted and reflected in Policy AS1.5 (now 8.15), AS1.6 (now 8.24) and S5.1 (2.1). | No amendments proposed. |
| 894730 | | RESIDENT | LP2015442 | More should be used to regenerate jobs and business in the area. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Economic development is one of the key themes running through the Local Plan and the vision sets out how by 2032 it wants to see a 'flourishing economy' and North Tyneside to be a 'place where local businesses are able to thrive and is attractive to inward investment' and an objective for the Local Plan is to 'provide excellent job opportunities for everyone' and to revitalise the town centres, regenerate the coast and regenerate the riverside. The Plan sets out policies that seek to achieve this vision and meet those objectives. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894746 | | RESIDENT | LP2015445 | Create more jobs and support business start-ups - focus on North West, Cobalt Business Park and Whitley Bay | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted and reflected in Policy AS1.5 (now 8.15), AS1.6 (now 8.24) and S5.1 (2.1). | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015468 | We note North Tyneside's strategic aspirations and updated assessed needs for growth in policies S5.1-5.2, S6.1-6.3 and S7.1 (now S4.1)-7.2 plus DM7.6, including: i,- to provide for up to (a revised down) 146.09ha of general employment land between 2014-2032 (at an annual average 8ha per annum), plus a further 35.94ha of reserved expansion land, representing a reduction from the previously proposed 170ha provision; | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015495 | Site 109: The LPA should be planning positively for biodiversity, seeking net gain and producing a coherent and functioning wildlife corridor network. Many of the current allocations for development, such as sites 22-26, 35-41 and 109 do not meet this and will ultimately result in a net loss of biodiversity with fragmented small areas of habitat, not linked by a workable network of wildlife corridors. Furthermore, NWT consider that the LPA are not planning positively for biodiversity and not meeting the requirements of NNPF by failing to produce a strategic map of identified areas for biodiversity off-setting, mitigation, compensation and wildlife habitat creation. Indeed NWT has met with Council representatives and proposed this prior to the publication of this and this has not been included. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Policies S8.4 (now 5.4), DM8.5 (now 5.5) and DM8.6 (now 5.6) are consistent with the guidance set out in the NNPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites 22-26, 35-41 and 109 have wildlife corridors running through them there is no reason to consider why these sites could not accommodate future development whilst adhering to the policies and maintaining a linked workable network of wildlife corridors. The Council officers comment on site 109 were that 'Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality wildlife corridors were not incorporated into any scheme'. The Council are keen to work with NWT to consider areas for biodiversity off-setting, mitigation, compensation and wildlife habitat creation and will look forward to further dialogue. | No amendments proposed. |
| 895180 | | RESIDENT | LP2015517 | Site NT030: Again more employment in Cobalt, what are the proposals for traffic management? Cobalt is extremely busy for access. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of public transport users, cyclists | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | Development | and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 895338 | | RESIDENT | LP2015522 | The figures for the number of new homes (and the assumed new inhabitants of these) seems far greater than the number of new jobs. Where will the additional inhabitants work? Where is the land that will be used to create new jobs? This has not been explained. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | The Local Plan outlines the need for 10,200 new homes in addition to the 5,000 homes already with planning permission. The estimated level of job growth is expected to be at least 12,700 jobs. The amount of new jobs and new homes has been considered in relationship to each other as part of the evidence in the future growth forecasts for North Tyneside. Sites to accommodate this level of employment growth are outlined in Policy 5.2 (now 2.2). The Local Plan seeks to increase the provision employment opportunities within the Borough to help create sustainable communities. Identifying a flexible supply of land that offers a variety of potential employment uses allows new and existing businesses the opportunity to deliver future economic growth. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015576 | Site 109: Objection: This site along with the allocation of site 4 will effectively cause the isolation of Gosforth Park SSSI and Local Wildlife Sites. Not only could this adversely impact upon a statutorily protected site (contrary to paragraph 118 of NPPF) but this would also have significant adverse effects upon the Wildlife Corridor, as such not meeting the requirements of paragraph 114 | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The wildlife corridors have been mapped on the Policies Map and the Council are keen to work with partners such as Northumberland Wildlife Trust to identify areas for habitat restoration or creation and this is reflected in policy DM8.5 (now 5.5) 'maximise opportunities for creation, restoration, enhancement, management and connection of natural habitats'. Policies | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>of NPPF to plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity. Furthermore, this site is within the Wildlife Corridor and development within this would be adverse to the aims of the designation. This site has also been noted by the Northumberland Wildlife Trust to have developed habitats suitable for ground nesting birds (including farmland birds; BAP priority species) and wading birds. The loss of this could impact upon the aims of the Local BAP. The development of this site appears to be going ahead. NWT has seen the outline plans for the area "" Indigo Business Park. However, these plans did not include the most eastern end and NWT was assured that this area would remain open as a wildlife corridor to link Gosforth Park SSSI to Weetslade Country Park. This does not appear to be the case from the Local Plan, as the entire area is allocated. It is very difficult to see how the plans, in their current form, allow for any wildlife movement in and out of a nationally designated site and into the wider area, including Weetslade Country Park. Furthermore, as with many of the site allocations a wildlife corridor has been allocated across this area, but again there is no actual provision for this on the ground and such an allocation therefore appears untenable.</p> | | | <p>S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now 5.5, 5.6, 5.7) are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites are suggested for development in the Plan that have wildlife corridors running through them, the precise location of development within these sites has not been determined and the policies of the Plan highlighted the need for wildlife corridors to be accommodated within future development. Council officer's comment on site 109 was 'Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality wildlife corridors were not incorporated into any scheme'.</p> | |
| 897295 | | RESIDENT | LP2015602 | <p>Site NT031: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example Site 11 now Site E010 contains a Site of Local Wildlife Interest.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 11 now Site E010), but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1 (now S5.1), DM8.2 (now 5.2), S8.4 (now S5.4)and DM8.5 (now DM5.5). The comment from the Councils biodiversity officer highlighted the designated Site of Local Conservation Interest on the site and this would have to be appropriately protected if the site were to be developed. Also the land adjacent to Longbenton Letch and the valuable grassland and scrubland on site would necessitate adequate surveys and mitigation to be provided before any development commenced on site. | |
| 897295 | | RESIDENT | LP2015603 | Site NT058: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example site 109 is located on a wildlife corridor. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Policies S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6) are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites are suggested for development in the Plan that have wildlife corridors running through them, the precise location of development within these sites has not been determined and the policies of the Plan highlights the need for wildlife corridors to be accommodated within future development. Council officer's comment on | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | site 109 was 'Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality wildlife corridors were not incorporated into any scheme'. | |
| 897407 | | RESIDENT | LP2015626 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to strongly object to the proposal of development of the greenfield site. This area provides a mini-greenbelt between Benton and Wallsend and provides both areas with separate identities. Local infrastructure would struggle to cope as is already the case on Whitley Road. This results in increased traffic (at significant speed) through Grange Avenue / Thornhill Road (both residential roads). Development of these sites would lose the view from Whitley Road across to Gateshead further detracting from the area. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. A large proportion of this site is already developed for employment purposes by Proctor and Gamble. The surrounding fields next to the P&G site are allocated as reserve employment land. This is land controlled by the existing business and is available solely as potential expansion land to the current business. The evidence on employment growth for North Tyneside over the next 15 years is positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment with coherent ecological networks. The importance of views in the local area are not a planning consideration in the Local Plan as there is no individual right to a view. In respect to the concerns of the transport infrastructure coping with the levels of growth, the Council has around £150million to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed investment in junction improvements will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 804813 | | | LP2015633 | From what we have already seen, the proposed increase in housing is planned on the basis that there will be approximately 800 new jobs a year in North Tyneside between now and 2032. On the basis of this highly ambitious and (we think) unrealistic forecast, much that is of value in green and open space which enhance the quality of life will be permanently lost. What will happen if these jobs do not materialize and the demand for housing is much lower? Apart from the building contractors, who will profit from the unoccupied rows of quick-build housing and who will maintain them in the future? | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Plan suggests a job growth forecast of 707 jobs per year, which was recommended within the Employment Land Review (ELR). The consultants who produced the ELR used a variety of different sources of evidence and experience from a national, regional and local level. The numbers of homes to be needed during the course of the Local Plan are not just determined by economic growth but also population projections and migration trends. The Policies and the evidence in the Local will be monitored and updated to ensure they are being implemented. If they are not then the Policy and/or evidence will be reviewed to establish the issues affecting its delivery (Policy S11.1 now 9.1). There are many variables that are beyond the influence of planning but the Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. This has to be based on robust evidence available at the time of making that decision. The current evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with the objective to also protect and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | enhance the natural environment and the image of the Borough at the same time. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now 5.1, 5.2, dm5.4, dm5.5). Those people benefitting from houses built in the Borough will be those who want to live in the Borough but are restricted by the lack of housing on the market that suits their circumstances. The evidence of population growth and migration trends suggest there is (and will be) demand for housing in the Borough and that it would therefore be unlikely that houses would be unoccupied and suffering from a lack of maintenance. | |
| 897356 | | RESIDENT | LP2015650 | Site 11 now Site E010: Having reviewed the plan I am totally opposed to any development of Site 11 now Site E010 (Land in between Greenhaugh & Balliol business park) Site 11 now Site E010 is an area of local wildlife interest & is a major wildlife corridor, the only one left in West Moor & the main artery for the wider area, providing a vital link to Gosforth woods & the Rising Sun Country park. Site 11 now Site E010 is already a well utilized equestrian centre & is the only one in the area, removal of which would be detrimental to the local & wider community. The roads around Site 11 now Site E010 are already massively congested, at peak times the traffic is at a complete stand still. Any development of Site 11 now Site E010 would only add more traffic problems to an already crippled network. I have reviewed the councils proposed transport/roads improvements & do not believe they will | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment logged and noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 11 now Site E010), but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.5). The comment from the Councils biodiversity officer for Site 11, now Site E010, highlighted the designated Site of Local Conservation Interest on the site and this would have to be appropriately | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | provide any benefits or ease the current congestion problems. Please confirm my comments & opposition the development of Site 11 now Site E010 will be logged/recorded & taken forward by the council. | | | protected if the site were to be developed. Also the land adjacent to Longbenton Letch and the valuable grassland and scrubland on site would necessitate adequate surveys and mitigation to be provided before any development commenced on site. The transport infrastructure would need to be capable of delivering the growth projections and this has been considered within the transport modelling looking at future impact and the how the £150million investment over the next five years will help towards the potential levels of economic growth outlined in the Local Plan. | |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015661 | Positively Prepared - no Justified - no Effective - no Consistency to NPPF - no Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - yes Objection: The Coal Authority is pleased to see that the Site Analysis 2015 identifies those sites which are within the defined Development High Risk Area. However, neither the Site Analysis nor the Sustainable Appraisal appears to consider mineral safeguarding and potential prior extraction opportunities. Mineral safeguarding and potential for prior extraction should be a consideration when identifying sites for new development in order to ensure that there is no needless sterilisation of minerals on allocated sites. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The site analysis work has identified those sites that are within the defined Development High Risk Area but it would then be for the Policy of DM8.14 (now 5.14) to be applied prior to development taking place. The whole of the Plan area has been identified as a Mineral Safeguarding Area and DM8.14 (now 5.14) outlines that due consideration is given to avoiding sterilisation of a resource and allowing the option for prior extraction. | No amendments proposed. |
| 897784 | | RESIDENT | LP2015671 | "Chicken and egg situation" - creation of new jobs taken up by people already living in the area or houses built but bought by people who already have enough income to buy. People seem to drive ever increasing distances to work. Whether building for | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The numbers of jobs are based on the work of economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside. There are many contributing factors that have helped feed into the work on the ELR and it draws | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | employment or housing all areas highlighted seem to suggest future traffic problems. The reviews used to determine jobs/homes numbers is speculative?? | | | on the economic forecasts from the North East Local Economic Partnership. However, it has to be accepted that it is incredibly difficult to predict the economy over a 15 year time frame but it is a requirement of the Local Plan to plan for the level of growth over this period. The numbers of new homes are based on the evidence compiled by a team of consultants who looked at various data sources such as Office for National Statistics. The Local Plan seeks to provide employment and housing opportunities in the Borough that would reduce the need for of those who live in the Borough to commute out for work (currently 50%). The sites for housing and employment use have been considered in the transport modelling work for North Tyneside and have helped secure around £150million highways funding that will make it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. | |
| 897837 | | | LP2015680 | Site NT058: I have read a number of the comments on this particular comments and in particular I think that comments LP2015629, LP2015533 and LP2015627 are valid and well made. Whilst I recognise the need for plans to be put into place, I agree that to build on the likes of Killingworth Moor, Murton Village and land around Weetslade and Gosforth Parks would be an absolute travesty. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now 5.1, 5.2, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | 5.4, 5.5). These policies would have to be appropriately adhered to if the site were to be developed and it might not be that the whole site is appropriate for development due to the impact on wildlife. | |
| 897837 | | | LP2015681 | Site NT055: I have read a number of the comments on this particular comments and in particular I think that comments LP2015629, LP2015533 and LP2015627 are valid and well made. Whilst I recognise the need for plans to be put into place, I agree that to build on the likes of Killingworth Moor, Murton Village and land around Weetslade and Gosforth Parks would be an absolute travesty. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.5). These policies would have to be appropriately adhered to if the site were to be developed and it might not be that the whole site is appropriate for development due to the impact on wildlife. | No amendments proposed. |
| 897837 | | | LP2015682 | Site NT057: I have read a number of the comments on this particular comments and in particular I think that comments LP2015629, LP2015533 and LP2015627 are valid and well made. Whilst I recognise the need for plans to be put into place, I agree that to build on the likes of Killingworth Moor, Murton Village and land around Weetslade and Gosforth Parks would be an absolute travesty. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.5). These policies would have to be appropriately adhered to if the site were to be developed and it might not be that the whole site is appropriate for development due to the impact on wildlife. | |
| 898186 | | RESIDENT | LP2015720 | Site NT058: I have also noted in your Spring Edition of 'Our North Tyneside' that you mention the proposed Indigo Park. This is not a proposal but a certainty as Knight Frank is already advertising units for sale on the 82 acre site adjoining the Northumberland Wildlife Park so why can't you just tell the truth? You are determined to build on land used as a valuable wildlife corridor regardless of what the public think. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | The Council has a priority to increase investment, business and jobs in the Borough. The Local Plan Consultation 2015 proposes to continue to allocate the land at Indigo Park for employment uses, which would support this aspiration. Any development on this site would require planning permission and this could be submitted at any time but no planning application had been submitted at the time of consultation. It should be noted that the site has been allocated for employment uses in the previous Unitary Development Plan which was adopted in 2002. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898208 | | RESIDENT | LP2015726 | Site NT031: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example Site 11 now Site E010 contains a Site of Local Wildlife Interest | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will result in a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |
| 898208 | | RESIDENT | LP2015727 | Site NT058: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example site 109 is | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. Policies S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6) are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | located on a wildlife corridor | | Employment Development | advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites are suggested for development in the Plan that have wildlife corridors running through them, the precise location of development within these sites has not been determined and the policies of the Plan highlights the need for wildlife corridors to be accommodated within future development. Council officer's comment on site 109 was 'Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality wildlife corridors were not incorporated into any scheme'. | |
| 898230 | | RESIDENT | LP2015733 | Site NT031: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example Site 11 now Site E010 contains a Site of Local Wildlife Interest | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 11 now Site E010), but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.5). The comment from the Councils biodiversity officer highlighted the designated Site of Local Conservation Interest on the site and this would have to be appropriately protected if the site were to be developed. | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Also the land adjacent to Longbenton Letch and the valuable grassland and scrubland on site would necessitate adequate surveys and mitigation to be provided before any development commenced on site. | |
| 898230 | | RESIDENT | LP2015734 | Site NT058: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example site 109 is located on a wildlife corridor | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Policies S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6) are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites are suggested for development in the Plan that have wildlife corridors running through them, the precise location of development within these sites has not been determined and the policies of the Plan highlights the need for wildlife corridors to be accommodated within future development. Council officer's comment on site 109 was 'Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality wildlife corridors were not incorporated into any scheme'. | No amendments proposed. |
| 590531 | | | LP2015738 | NT055: I object to the following area being designated as employment land for the reasons below "ç The area around the Findus factory has been prone to severe flooding over the last 5 years surely any more building on sites will make this worse "ç Traffic is already severely congested in that area every morning and evening whilst ""improvements' are being made to the major routes, the minor roads through West Moor, Killingworth and Forest Hall cant cope with any more traffic "ç Both these areas are Wildlife habitats, with no 9 directly opposite Gosforth | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, whilst also having policies reflecting wildlife interests and open space provision in Policy | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | Park, any more building, noise, and pollution will affect the wildlife in the area. "ç Whilst the land is not green belt it would be nice to have some open spaces remaining without feeling totally enclosed. | | | S8.1 (now 5.1), DM8.2 (now 5.2), DM8.4 (now 5.4) and DM8.5 (now 5.5). The £150million investment of traffic improvements in the Borough are based on the major junctions but these improvements are expected to improve the wider network therefore making it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. Policy DM8.12 (now DM5.12) requires all major development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is covered in Policy 10.10 (now split into DM5.14 and DM5.15) and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. Where development is judged to potentially impact on drainage capacity, applicants are expected to contribute to off-setting these impacts (flood reduction works) by working with the Council and its drainage partners. | |
| 590531 | | | LP2015739 | NT031: I object to the following area being designated as employment land for the reasons below "The area around the Findus factory has been prone to severe flooding over the last 5 years surely any more building on sites will make this worse " Traffic is already severely congested in that area every morning and evening whilst ""improvements' are being made to the major routes, the minor roads through West Moor, Killingworth and Forest Hall cant cope with any more | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan to set out the future development allocations and policies to guide decisions made on planning applications. The reality for North Tyneside is that when considering where future development will go there is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth needed. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | traffic "Both these areas are Wildlife habitats, with no 9 directly opposite Gosforth Park, any more building, noise, and pollution will affect the wildlife in the area. "Whilst the land is not green belt it would be nice to have some open spaces remaining without feeling totally enclosed. | | | whilst also having policies reflecting wildlife interests and open space provision in Policy S8.1 (now 5.1), DM8.2 (now 5.2), DM8.4 (now 8.4) and DM8.5 (now 8.5). The £150million investment of traffic improvements in the Borough are based on the major junctions but these improvements are expected to improve the wider network therefore making it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. Policy DM8.12 (now DM5.12) requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is covered in Policy 10.10 (now split into DM5.14 and DM5.15)and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. Where development is judged to potentially impact on drainage capacity, applicants are expected to contribute to off-setting these impacts (flood reduction works) by working with the Council and its drainage partners. | |
| 898375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015762 | Site NT031: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example Site 11 now Site E010 contains a Site of Local Wildlife Interest. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11, now Site E010 (NT031), will be | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 898375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015763 | Site NT058: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example site 109 is located on a wildlife corridor. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Policies S8.4 (now 5.4), DM8.5 (5.5) and DM8.6 (5.6) are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites are suggested for development in the Plan that have wildlife corridors running through them, the precise location of development within these sites has not been determined and the policies of the Plan highlights the need for wildlife corridors to be accommodated within future development. Council officer's comment on site 109 was 'Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality wildlife corridors were not incorporated into any scheme'. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015765 | Site NT055: Of particular concern is the potential development of a large private leisure centre by Max-a-Millions on Salters Lane, West Moor, directly opposite Gosforth Park Nature Reserve, a significant local wildlife area. I am also concerned that it may be the intention to commence land clearance on March 19th without full assessment by the | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The potential Max-a-Millions development will be subject to a planning application that will determine whether it is acceptable development and will involve the consultation with the relevant bodies. The site is currently allocated for employment use within the Unitary Development Plan and the site | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | relevant bodies never mind the imposing visual distraction of the development from information currently online. The site is undoubtedly a wildlife support/corridor for the main reserve with a number of breeding birds already there. This should be taken account of in any future redevelopment. | | | analysis for the Local Plan recognises the proximity to Gosforth Park SSSI. This does not lead to a conclusion that the site could not accommodate future appropriate development but would require adequate survey and mitigation work to be carried out as well as consideration of adjacent watercourses and ditches re: flooding and pollution. | |
| 791057 | | RESIDENT | LP2015770 | I don't see any evidence of the 12,700 new jobs can you tell me the companies planning to set up manufacturing in the area? I doubt it. If you say "Hitachi" "Nissan" these are not in our catchment area. You are just creating short term employment for construction companies, leaving us to deal with the mess. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The numbers of jobs are based on the work of economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside. There are many contributing factors that have helped feed into the work on the ELR and it draws on the economic forecasts from the North East Local Economic Partnership. The ELR considers previous take up rates of employment land from an annual monitoring survey and considers the market perception of the Borough and market signals to indicate future demand in occupancy or investment. It does not reference future companies seeking to invest in the area but the overall conclusion of the ELR is the amount of employment land that is required to be accommodated in the Borough for the next 15 years. | No amendments proposed. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015774 | I agree completely with the figure for employment growth. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 464454 | | RESIDENT | LP2015820 | Site NT031: I object to the following areas being designated as employment land of any following sites: 9 and 11. For the reasons | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>below "ç The area around the Findus factory has been prone to severe flooding over the last 5 years surely any more building on sites will make this worse "ç Traffic is already severely congested in that area every morning and evening whilst "improvements' are being made to the major routes, the minor roads through West Moor, Killingworth and Forest Hall cant cope with any more traffic "ç Site 11 now Site E010 is a site of local wildlife importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other to. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority to Murton and Killingworth in the plan, I wonder why the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. "ç Also the land at no 9 which is adjacent to a SSSI site of conservational importance in Newcastle and serves the habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. "ç Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and I wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | Employment Development | <p>North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. Site 9, now Site E008, , now Site E008 (NT055), is not a designated wildlife site and although it is adjacent to Gosforth Park SSSI the presence of Salters' Lane would be considered as a deterrent to wildlife movement, but future development would need to be in accordance with Policy</p> | <p>issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | DM8.5 (now DM 5.5) with appropriate ecological surveys carried out to industry guidelines if there reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats prior to development. Wildlife interests are also considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4. (now 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4) | |
| 464454 | | RESIDENT | LP2015821 | <p>Site NT055: I object to the following areas being designated as employment land of any following sites: 9 and 11. For the reasons below "ç The area around the Findus factory has been prone to severe flooding over the last 5 years surely any more building on sites will make this worse "ç Traffic is already severely congested in that area every morning and evening whilst ""improvements' are being made to the major routes, the minor roads through West Moor, Killingworth and Forest Hall cant cope with any more traffic "ç Site 11 now Site E010 is a site of local wildlife importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other to. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority to Murton and Killingworth in the plan, I wonder why the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. "ç Also the land at no 9 which is adjacent to a SSSI site of conservational importance in Newcastle and serves the habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. "ç Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9 &11), but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) would be removed from the allocation of employment land but designated as green space and protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | increases in traffic and pollution and I wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. Site 9 (NT055) is not a designated wildlife site and although it is adjacent to Gosforth Park SSSI the presence of Salters' Lane would be considered as a deterrent to wildlife movement, but future development would need to be in accordance with Policy DM8.5 (now DM5.5) with appropriate ecological surveys carried out to industry guidelines if there reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats prior to development. Wildlife interests are also considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4. (now 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4) | |
| 898636 | | RESIDENT | LP2015878 | Site NT012: I want to object to the council plans to allow green field land, adjacent to Whitley Road to be built upon for whatever purpose, be it housing or industrial. There is far to much building on green field sites already. What about the quality of life for people living near the area. There has always been a feeling of open space in this part of north Tyneside which is good for peoples wellbeing. I am also deeply concerned for the wildlife that will die or not even have the chance to live, as a result. Also the roads around here are far too congested already. It will cause increased stress to anyone travelling in the area as a consequence of increasing the population. The council should look after the people currently resident in North Tyneside and not be pressured by the | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment logged and noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest sites for development, such as Site 12, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5). The transport infrastructure would need to be capable of delivering the growth projections | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | Government or big business into taking action that will certainly be detrimental to the wellbeing of all who live here. | | | and this has been considered within the transport modelling looking at future impact and the how the £150million investment over the next five years will help towards the potential levels of economic growth outlined in the Local Plan. | |
| 592321 | | RESIDENT | LP2015915 | Site NT031: I wish to make the following objections to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of local wildlife importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why we, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 592321 | | RESIDENT | LP2015916 | Site NT055: We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land point 9 on the map which is adjacent to a SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Site 9, now Site E008, (NT055) is not a designated wildlife site and although it is adjacent to Gosforth Park SSSI future development would need to be in accordance with Policy DM8.5 (now DM5.5) with appropriate ecological surveys carried out to industry guidelines if there is reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats prior to development. Wildlife interests are also considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4 (now 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4). | No amendments proposed. |
| 898785 | | RESIDENT | LP2015917 | Site NT031: I wish to make the following objections to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | would show it to be a site of local wildlife importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why we, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | | on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. This policy would cover the proposed safeguarded land to the south of West Moor and a northern section of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) covering the Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI). The justification of such a policy would be to reflect the significance of the open space to the character of West Moor and protection of biodiversity value. The site is in close proximity to the Gosforth Park SSSI, includes the SLCI and responds to the advice from the Councils biodiversity officer who recommended 'The SLCI should remain undeveloped and adequately buffered by any potential future development'. | |
| 898785 | | RESIDENT | LP2015918 | Site NT055: We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land point 9 on the map which is adjacent to a SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Borough. Site 9, now Site E008, (NT055) is not a designated wildlife site and although it is adjacent to Gosforth Park SSSI future development would need to be in accordance with Policy DM8.5 (now DM5.5) with appropriate ecological surveys carried out to industry guidelines if there is reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats prior to development. Wildlife interests are also considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4 (now S5.1, DM5.2 & DM5.4). | |
| 898787 | | RESIDENT | LP2015919 | Site NT031: I wish to make the following objections to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of local wildlife importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why we, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 898787 | | RESIDENT | LP2015920 | Site NT055: We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land point 9 on the map which is adjacent to a SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Site 9, now Site E008, (NT055) is not a designated wildlife site and although it is adjacent to Gosforth Park SSSI future development would need to be in accordance with Policy DM8.5 (now DM 5.5) with appropriate ecological surveys carried out to industry guidelines if there is reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats prior to development. Wildlife interests are also considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4 (now 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4) | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| 898790 | | RESIDENT | LP2015922 | Site NT031: I wish to make the following objections to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of local wildlife importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why we, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |
| 898790 | | RESIDENT | LP2015923 | Site NT055: We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land point 9 on the map which is adjacent to a SSSI site of | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | Employment Development | North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Site 9, now Site E008, (NT055) is not a designated wildlife site and although it is adjacent to Gosforth Park SSSI future development would need to be in accordance with Policy DM8.5 (now 5.5) with appropriate ecological surveys carried out to industry guidelines if there is reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats prior to development. Wildlife interests are also considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4. (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4) | |
| 898796 | | RESIDENT | LP2015925 | Site NT031: I wish to make the following objections to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of local wildlife importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why we, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | | environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 898796 | | RESIDENT | LP2015926 | Site NT055: We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land point 9 on the map which is adjacent to a SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Site 9, now Site E008, (NT055) is not a designated wildlife site and although it | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | is adjacent to Gosforth Park SSSI future development would need to be in accordance with Policy DM8.5 (now DM 5.5) with appropriate ecological surveys carried out to industry guidelines if there is reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats prior to development. Wildlife interests are also considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4. (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4) | |
| 898806 | | RESIDENT | LP2015928 | Site NT031: I wish to make the following objections to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of local wildlife importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why we, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 898806 | | RESIDENT | LP2015929 | Site NT055: We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land point 9 on the map which is adjacent to a SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Site 9, now Site E008, (NT055) is not a designated wildlife site and although it is adjacent to Gosforth Park SSSI future development would need to be in accordance with Policy DM8.5 (now DM5.5) with appropriate ecological surveys carried out to industry guidelines if there is reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats prior to development. Wildlife interests are also considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4. (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4) | No amendments proposed. |
| 463857 | | | LP2015930 | Site NT031: I wish to make the following objections to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|----------------------------|
| | | | | <p>around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of local wildlife importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why we, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left.</p> | | Employment Development | <p>North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | issues, will be clarified. |
| 463857 | | | LP2015932 | <p>Site NT055: We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land point 9 on the map which is adjacent to a SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the North West</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | | is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Site 9, now Site E008, , now Site E008 (NT055) is not a designated wildlife site and although it is adjacent to Gosforth Park SSSI future development would need to be in accordance with Policy DM8.5 (now DM5.5) with appropriate ecological surveys carried out to industry guidelines if there is reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats prior to development. Wildlife interests are also considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4. (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4) | |
| 467655 | | RESIDENT | LP2015933 | Site NT031: I wish to make the following objections to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of local wildlife importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why we, the people of West Moor | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | cannot be afforded the same privileges. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | | designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 467655 | | RESIDENT | LP2015934 | Site NT055: We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land point 9 on the map which is adjacent to a SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Site 9, now Site E008, (NT055) is not a designated wildlife site and although it is adjacent to Gosforth Park SSSI future development would need to be in accordance with Policy DM8.5 (now DM5.5) | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | with appropriate ecological surveys carried out to industry guidelines if there is reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats prior to development. Wildlife interests are also considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4. (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4) | |
| 898815 | | RESIDENT | LP2015935 | Site NT031: I wish to make the following objections to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of local wildlife importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why we, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9 & 11), but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) would be removed from the allocation of employment land but designated as green space and protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 898815 | | RESIDENT | LP2015936 | Site NT055: We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land point 9 on the map which is adjacent to a SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the North West will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protest what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Site 9, now Site E008, , now Site E008, (NT055) is not a designated wildlife site and although it is adjacent to Gosforth Park SSSI future development would need to be in accordance with Policy DM8.5 (now DM5.5) with appropriate ecological surveys carried out to industry guidelines if there is reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats prior to development. Wildlife interests are also considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4. (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4) | No amendments proposed. |
| 898831 | | RESIDENT | LP2015944 | NT012: A high proportion of the proposed sites are in a small concentrated area where large sites with planning permission already exist. Roads are already overcrowded, natural boundaries between areas will be lost e.g. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Site NT012/110 is currently an employment site and the remaining area of the employment site that is undeveloped is classified as reserved land, which is available solely as potential | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | Benton will merge with Wallsend. Please leave existing green areas alone. If you must build please use brownfield sites only, preferably within easy access of major traffic dispersal. Roads such as the A19. Sites 27 and 28 are close to the A19. There is an already disproportionate amount of development in and around the former 'villages' of Benton and Forest Hall compared to other parts. In the Borough of North Tyneside. The 'Consultation ' of November 2013, compared to the 'Consultation ' of February 2015, shows huge changes in the areas of Murton Village and Killingworth Moor, you state that this is in part to protect the Identity of Murton Village and to prevent Killingworth, Palmersville and Forest Hall merging, where in your plan is protection for the Benton Area? In fact compared to the 2013 , 2015's shows large additions in the Benton Area- Areas 111 and 139. Please address this imbalance and stop any further development in and around the Benton Area. | | | expansion land. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest sites for development, including those employment areas that are already developed, such as Site 11 now Site E010, whilst balancing many issues such as protecting and enhancing the natural environment and to enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5. The transport infrastructure will need to be capable of delivering the growth projections of the Local Plan and this has been considered within the transport modelling work that has led to £150million funding allocated for junction improvements over the next five years. | |
| 898848 | | RESIDENT | LP2015954 | NT012/ Site 11 now Site E010: These are the last green spaces left between Benton, Wallsend and Palmersville which keep their identities separate. They also compliment the Rising Sun Country Park Nature Reserve, providing a realistic Wildlife Corridor and Habitat. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Site NT012/110 is currently an employment site, which is occupied by Proctor and Gamble. The remaining area of the employment site that is undeveloped is classified as reserved land, which is available solely as potential expansion land. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest sites for development, including those employment areas that are already developed, such as Site 11 now Site E0100, whilst balancing many issues such as protecting and enhancing the natural environment and to enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 and DM5.5). The transport infrastructure will need to be capable of delivering the growth projections of the Local Plan and this has been considered within the transport modelling work that has led to £150million funding allocated for junction improvements over the next five years. | |
| 898912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015975 | Site 11 now Site E010: Development sites are proposed which, I am told, are contrary to planning policy. For example Site 11 now Site E010 contains a site of Local Wildlife Interest. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 898912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015976 | Site 109: Development sites are proposed which, I am told, are contrary to planning policy. For example site 109 is located on a wildlife corridor. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan setting out future land allocations and policies that will guide planning decisions. The independent Employment Land Review (2015) was produced by a team of specialists who considered the existing employment land and how much is required over the next 15 years to meet the levels of growth. The suggested sites in the consultation make provision for this predicted provision. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. National planning policy requires LPAs to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife and the Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Wildlife corridor | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | designation does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including site layout and the proposed area for development. Policies S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6) are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites are suggested for development in the Plan that have wildlife corridors running through them, the precise location of development within these sites has not been determined and the policies of the Plan highlights the need for wildlife corridors to be accommodated within future development. Council officer's comment on site 109 was 'Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality wildlife corridors were not incorporated into any scheme'. | |
| 898912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015978 | I have a particular interest in Gosforth Park Nature Reserve, which is in danger of becoming enclosed by development. The reserve lies just outside North Tyneside, but needs co-operation from North Tyneside Council, to ensure it is connected to the wider world via Wildlife Corridors. The Max-a-Millions development on the other side of the boundary seems to make no concessions to the need for such corridors. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council recognises Gosforth SSSI within the Local Plan and development proposals in North Tyneside that could impact a nationally designated site are covered within Policy DM8.5 (now 5.5). The Council have worked with adjoining Councils biodiversity officers to consider the wildlife corridors in the Borough and how they connect with the neighbouring authorities. These wildlife corridors are shown on the Policies map and considered in Policy S8.4 (now 5.4) | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 898630 | | | LP20151270 | I object to the use of Site 11 now Site E010/NT012 for industrial use and certainly the part alongside Whitley Road. This will make the traffic congestion on Whitley Road even worse, it will remove the last remaining green area north of the road with a corresponding impact on wildlife - the bottom end of the site is part of a 'wildlife corridor', and it will reduce the quality of life for residents in the area. Generally, please provide evidence of the new jobs that are going to be coming and please use empty space and brownfield sites first before building more units on greenfield sites. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Site NT012/110 is currently an employment site, which is occupied by Proctor and Gamble. The remaining area of the employment site that is undeveloped is classified as reserved land, which is available solely as potential expansion land. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest sites for development, including those employment areas that are already developed, such as Site 11 now Site E010, whilst balancing many issues such as protecting and enhancing the natural environment and to enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5). The transport infrastructure will need to be capable of delivering the growth projections of the Local Plan and this has been considered within the transport modelling work that has led to £150million funding allocated for junction improvements over the next five years. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899455 | | | LP20151281 | I object to the use of Site 11 now Site E010/NT012 for industrial use and certainly the part alongside Whitley Road. This will make the traffic congestion on Whitley Road even worse, it will remove the last remaining | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Site NT012/110 is currently an employment site, which is occupied by Proctor and Gamble. The remaining area of the employment site that is undeveloped is classified as reserved land, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | green area north of the road with a corresponding impact on wildlife. | | | which is available solely as potential expansion land. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest sites for development, including those employment areas that are already developed, such as Site 11 now Site E010, whilst balancing many issues such as protecting and enhancing the natural environment and to enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5). The transport infrastructure will need to be capable of delivering the growth projections of the Local Plan and this has been considered within the transport modelling work that has led to £150million funding allocated for junction improvements over the next five years. | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151334 | Policy S5:2. Provision of land for employment development. CPRE is concerned that: "ç development of NT058 (Weetslade) NT014 (Sandy Lane) should not adversely affect wildlife corridors and the Weetslade Country Park. "ç development of NT055 (Gosforth Business Park) should not adversely affect wildlife corridors and the Gosforth Nature Reserve. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan setting out future land allocations and policies that will guide planning decisions. The independent Employment Land Review (2015) was produced by a team of specialists who considered the existing employment land and how much is required over the next 15 years to meet the levels of growth. The suggested sites in the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | consultation make provision for this predicted provision. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. National planning policy requires LPAs to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife and the Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Wildlife corridor designation does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including site layout and the proposed area for development. Policies S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5))are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites are suggested for development in the Plan that have wildlife corridors running through them, the precise location of development within these sites has not been determined and the policies of the Plan highlights the need for wildlife corridors to be accommodated within future development. | |
| 472456 | | RESIDENT | LP20151403 | Site 109: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example Site 11 now Site E010 contains a Site of Local Wildlife Interest, site 109 is located on a wildlife corridor and part of sites 35-41 is to provide ecological | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan setting out future land allocations and policies that will guide planning decisions. The independent Employment Land Review (2015) was produced by a team of | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | compensation for a development elsewhere in the borough. | | | specialists who considered the existing employment land and how much is required over the next 15 years to meet the levels of growth. The suggested sites in the consultation make provision for this predicted provision. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. National planning policy requires LPAs to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife and the Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Wildlife corridor designation does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including site layout and the proposed area for development. Policies S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now 5.4,5.5 and 5.6)are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites are suggested for development in the Plan that have wildlife corridors running through them, the precise location of development within these sites has not been determined and the policies of the Plan highlights the need for wildlife corridors to be accommodated within future development. Council officer’s comment on site 109 was ‘Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | wildlife corridors were not incorporated into any scheme'. the boundary of Site 11 now Site E010 will be amended to clearly show the Site of Local Conservation Importance that lies to the north of the site. The ecological compensation agreed from the recent planning appeal at Station Road will need to be considered as part of the Masterplan work for sites 35-41. | |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151429 | I would like to make the following broad objections to the North Tyneside Local Plan: The Plan is based on growth rates which are unrealistic, despite earlier consultation demonstrating that North Tyneside residents wanted to aim for lower rate of growth in order to save valued green spaces. The ceding of population to Newcastle and Gateshead is not adequately reflected in the growth figures. The proportion of employment land proposed in the Local Plan is currently too high but housing development on some of the proposed employment sites (other than those outlined above) could help to achieve a sufficient growth is housing stock over the planned time horizon. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The evidence produced from independent consultants on levels of growth in North Tyneside and the reality of recent planning appeals at places such as Scaffold Hill near Holystone, Whitehouse Farm, near West Moor and Station Road at Wallsend have all reinforced the need for the Council to bring forward additional sites to meet the levels of growth being forecast. This is a recommendation from national government guidance (NPPF) and the Council is working with its neighbouring authorities to reflect the levels of population growth between the different authorities in the Local Plan. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151430 | Site 11 now Site E010: This site is designated as a Site of Local Wildlife Interest (West Moor meadow) and also forms part of a key wildlife corridor providing an important link which allows the movement of wildlife between | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | Killingworth and Gosforth. Development on this site would destroy a Site of Local Wildlife Interest and would therefore be contrary to other policies in the Plan and the NPPF. In particular, there is a presumption that Local Plans will direct development to locations where there will not be an adverse impact on biodiversity when there are less damaging alternatives available (otherwise the Plan could not be considered sustainable). It is clear that there are other sites which would not involve destroying a site of conservation interest and therefore this site should be excluded from the Plan. Given the proximity of existing housing and the Balliol Business Park, development would curtail the existing wildlife corridor and fragment local wildlife populations. There is already adequate employment land adjacent to Site 11 now Site E010 and therefore, further development in this vicinity is unnecessary as well as unwelcome. For these reasons Site 11 now Site E010 should be removed as a development site from the Local Plan. | | | the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151431 | Site 109: o This proposed development site is in close proximity to a local wildlife site (Weetslade Country Park) and would be detrimental to nearby wildlife which uses the proposed site for forage, cover and breeding opportunities. o The site is also part of a key strategic wildlife corridor, linking wildlife in Newcastle and North Tyneside (and especially | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan setting out future land allocations and policies that will guide planning decisions. The independent Employment Land Review (2015) was produced by a team of specialists who considered the existing employment land and how much is required | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>within the Gosforth Park nature reserve) with the wider countryside of Northumberland. Development on the site would therefore have a deleterious impact on the movement of wildlife populations between areas and would be contrary to NPPF requirements for establishing coherent ecological networks. o There is already adequate employment land adjacent to site 109 and therefore, further development in this vicinity is unnecessary as well as unwelcome. o For these reasons site 109 should be removed as a development site from the Local Plan.</p> | | | <p>over the next 15 years to meet the levels of growth. The suggested sites in the consultation make provision for this predicted provision. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. National planning policy requires LPAs to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife and the Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Wildlife corridor designation does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including site layout and the proposed area for development. Policies S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now S5.4, DM5.5 and DM5.6) are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites are suggested for development in the Plan that have wildlife corridors running through them, the precise location of development within these sites has not been determined and the policies of the Plan highlights the need for wildlife corridors to be accommodated within future development. Council officer’s comment on site 109 was ‘Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality wildlife corridors were not incorporated into any scheme’.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|--------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| 803900 | Northumb erland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151529 | In relation to map reference 109 "" Weetslade, Sandy Lane, The Council notes that proposals to dual Sandy Lane, which featured in the UDP, have been replaced by proposals for ""targeted improvements' in Policy S10.3 Transport. Through our Duty to Cooperate discussions we would welcome further dialogue in relation to the potential impact of increased traffic movements on the A19, in particular on the Moor Farm Roundabout. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. This issue will be covered within the ongoing Duty to Cooperate meetings. | Discuss within the next Transport related Duty to Cooperate meetings. |
| 805535 | | | LP20151571 | Site 109: Indigo Park is welcomed but could another employment park be sited on the northern border ? | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. There are no new employment sites to be allocated north of Indigo Park but the existing employment sites in Seaton Burn and Dudley (Shasun) will remain in the Local Plan. Northumberland County Council are promoting Northumberland Business Park, next to Moor Farm roundabout, for high quality office accommodation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898777 | | | LP20151658 | Site 102 - reallocation for housing. The site is currently in employment use with this predominantly being B2 use, with the North Tyneside Local Plan Consultation seeking to retain the site moving forward for this current use. These representations seek to de- allocate this site from its employment use and re-allocate for residential which, it is considered, is more appropriate in planning terms, both in the context of the site itself and also the employment and housing land demand/supply position within North Tyneside. North Tyneside Council appointed Arup to prepare an updated Employment Land Review (ELR) as part of the evidence base to support the emerging Local Plan for | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Site 102 is currently an employment site and is considered a suitable site to deliver the overall employment land provision in the new Local Plan. The site has the potential to expand and with easy access to the A19 it is considered to be a suitable site for continued employment land provision. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the Borough. The ELR considers the period from 2014-2032 in line with the emerging Local Plan that is likely to be adopted in 2016. It forms the basis of planning policies for the retention, regeneration, or reuse of existing employment land, and for allocations for new employment land for B1, B2 and B8 uses. It also advises on the appropriate overall amount, type and distribution of employment land including an assessment of existing provision. The approach applied in the ELR is based on a combination of labour demand forecasts and targets adopted by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) which are considered in the context of evidence on historic market take-up. Overall, the approach is based on the consideration of a range of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, in order to inform the development of alternative scenarios for future growth. The ELR has run a series of employment growth scenarios, with these comprising the following: Employment Growth Scenario Job Creation High + 26,163 High 17,442 Medium + 16,443 Medium 12,730 Low 6,480 Following an analysis of each Employment Growth Scenario, including the historic relationship between job growth and employment land take-up of circa 690 jobs and 10 ha per year, and analysis of the potential employment capacity of available land within North Tyneside, an overall employment land portfolio of at least 146ha is recommended within the Consultation Local Plan in order to ensure that at least the "Medium' scenario of 707 jobs per annum is met. The Council's</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>ambitions to achieve employment growth identified at the upper end of the Growth Scenarios is welcomed and is reflective of the overall strategy for economic growth promoted within the NPPF. However, as part of the Employment Land Review, the employment demand driven scenarios anticipate the continued transition of the economy toward the service and knowledge-based sectors and contraction in the manufacturing sector, as indicated by independent forecasts produced by the LEP area. An outcome of this transition is that a greater proportion of future demand will be for office based uses rather than industrial space. Indeed, the ELR predicts a contraction in net land requirements for industrial space (B1c/B2) across all of the Employment Growth Scenarios with this negative requirement increasing the higher the employment growth targets are. In addition, and comparing against past take-up rates (circa 10 ha per annum), suggesting a potential need of 180 ha over the course of the 18 year Plan Period, the ELR also concludes that there is sufficient employment land supply (146 ha), in addition to the 36 ha of "reserve land" identified, providing a total of 182 ha. As part of the Employment Land Review, as highlighted above, a review of existing employment sites was undertaken. The Site Survey Data Base (February 2015) provides details of the latest site assessments. With regard to Swales Industrial Estate the assessment concluded the following: "Currently an employment site that is close to an area of regeneration and</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | potentially could be developed for uses other than employment." | | | | |
| 808917 | BDW North East | LAND DEVELOPER | LP20151774 | <p>The council must ensure that the council's employment strategy and housing strategy align. BDW believes the housing requirement should be increased to take account of opportunities for employment growth. The Local Plan states that the Cobalt Business Park and Quorum Business Park are completing soon and will become fully occupied, alongside new opportunities for growth through the North East Low Carbon Enterprise Zone. The council must ensure the housing target is sufficiently aspirational to take account of the proposed employment growth. Providing new housing for workers will attract companies to these new employment areas. NPPF, paragraph 17 states that planning should "proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, businesses and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs". It is essential that the council provide the homes to support economic growth. The figures put forward by the council in the Local Plan to meet the council's preferred approach, medium employment growth, demonstrate an oversupply of employment land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Net employment land requirement = 46.3ha (2.57ha per annum) • Land available for development to 2032 = 146ha (8ha per annum) and a further 36ha of reserved land <p>This gives a surplus of 136ha of employment land. BDW would urge the council to consider whether some of this employment land could</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The numbers of jobs are based on the work of economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside. There are many contributing factors that have helped feed into the work on the ELR and it draws on the economic forecasts from the North East Local Economic Partnership. The ELR considers previous take up rates of employment land from an annual monitoring survey and considers the market perception of the Borough and market signals to indicate future demand in occupancy or investment. The housing growth has drawn upon a combination of forecasts and scenarios that are considered deliverable.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>be re-allocated as housing land. As it stands the council's preferred employment land strategy is more aspirational than the housing strategy being proposed. It is important that the council ensure the two strategies align. BDW would like the council to review the employment strategy and provide justification for such an oversupply of employment land against the requirement. We would urge the council to consider whether some of this employment land could be re-allocated for housing to increase the housing numbers. The council must also ensure the housing and economic strategy align. The plan proposes an employment target of 707 additional jobs per annum. There are only 3 scenarios that plan for sufficient job growth per year to meet the requirement proposed: The proposed housing requirement of 792 homes per year only provides for 654 jobs per annum. This means using the proposed housing requirement would result in an undersupply of 53 jobs per annum or 1,113 jobs over the housing requirement period 2011-2032. This proposed requirement of 792 homes requires 46ha of employment land. This is 114ha less than currently available. Indicating a mismatch between the employment land allocations and the targets. BDW would urge the council to review the amount of land allocated for employment. The council should review the amount of land allocated for employment.</p> | | | | |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151795 | We note reference to a significant number of key sites identified for employment development over the plan period within Policy S5.2. The sites identified vary in terms | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment | Comment noted. | Keep NWL informed of future employment uses on the sites. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | of both scale and location, and as sites come forward for development we would recommend early consultation with NWL. This is particularly important where proposed land uses may require large volumes of water, or produce significant effluent during operation. Furthermore, we would urge all new economic development proposals to seek to adopt sustainable surface water management principles in the planning and design stages. | | Development | | |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151810 | Paragraph 5.10 of the Local Plan indicates that the Plan intends to support and promote the "Medium' scenario of 707 jobs per annum (12,750 over plan period). The Northumberland Estates support the creation of jobs in North Tyneside and the importance that this has for a strong and sustainable economy. It is considered that the Local Plan should follow the job growth forecasts in the Employment Land Review (para. 5.8), and the "Medium +' scenario be the scenario that the Local Plan pursues. It is considered that the "Medium +' scenario offers a greater level of economic growth than the "Medium' scenario, and that this scenario would be a more ambitious level of job creation that North Tyneside should be aiming for over the next plan period. There are several key job creating opportunities in North Tyneside. There are extensive opportunities relating to the river Tyne/port, as well as the A19 strategic growth corridor which includes major planning trunk road improvements over the plan period. North Tyneside has the capacity and infrastructure to attract significant investment from outside the | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The numbers of jobs are based on the work of economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside. There are many contributing factors that have helped feed into the work on the ELR and it draws on the economic forecasts from the North East Local Economic Partnership. The ELR considers previous take up rates of employment land from an annual monitoring survey and considers the market perception of the Borough and market signals to indicate future demand in occupancy or investment. It does not reference future companies seeking to invest in the area but the overall conclusion of the ELR is the amount of employment land that is required to be accommodated in the Borough for the next 15 years. Policy S5.2 (now 2.2) has been amended to clarify those sites that have available or reserved land and Backworth Business Park and Cottages will now be considered in the housing section as a mixed use site. | Policy S5.2 (now S2.2) amended to include only sites with available or reserved land |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>region, and it also benefits from its physical relationship with the city of Newcastle. All of these factors contribute to North Tyneside's capacity for employment growth and job creation. In comparison to its neighbouring Local Authorities, North Tyneside's projection of 12,750 jobs is significantly lower than Newcastle's 22,000 (''Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Newcastle and Gateshead'') and only slightly higher than Northumberland's 10,000 (''Local Plan Core Strategy'). It is considered that North Tyneside's Local Plan should increase its job creation figure from 12,750 in order to be at a more similar level to Newcastle, since this neighbouring Authority is more similar to North Tyneside in terms of size, infrastructure, and opportunities than neighbouring Northumberland. Policy S5.2 of the Local Plan identifies Backworth Business Park and Cottages (ELR ref. no. NT036) as a site that is available for employment land development over the plan period. However, it states that the total area of available land is 0 hectares. This is incorrect, since the site is available and has an area of approximately 6.3 hectares. The Northumberland Estates support this site as an available site for mixed use including employment throughout the plan period, and consider that the Local Plan should promote development of the site through its policies. It is also noted that the table in Policy S5.2 is not particularly clear, with the majority of development sites being detailed as having 0 hectares of available or reserved land. It is not</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | clear what this means, as the sites are allocated and identified by the plan as being suitable for development, but then stated as being neither available nor reserved. | | | | |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151829 | A number of the potential development sites are located in Flood Zones 3 and 2 and as such are at high/medium flood risk. We support that the proposed allocations within these flood risk areas are supported by a Flood Risk Sequential and Exception Test. Welcome that in allocating these sites a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development has been undertaken to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151832 | Site 11 now Site E010: The site is adjacent to Longbenton Letch watercourse. Development that encroaches on watercourses has a potentially severe impact on their ecological value and the land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected. We consider that there is a need to provide coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. In developing the site there are opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around the development. On this basis, we consider that any allocation should ensure the protection of the watercourse through providing an appropriate buffer zone to the watercourse that is free from development. As outlined urban diffuse pollution is a particular pressure on the water quality of urban watercourses in North Tyneside. We consider that any | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | development will need to manage surface water quality. On this basis, we would recommend that a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy will be required that demonstrates there is adequate foul and surface water capacity for the development the aim of reducing flood risk and ensuring no deterioration of water quality. We consider that in developing the site there is the need for an overall ambition to limit surface water drainage from the proposed development site in order to manage wider flood risks. The mechanisms for flooding within the area are complex and on this basis we consider that consideration is given to a range of flood risk scenarios. | | | proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. Wider flood risks will be considered in other policies in the Plan such as S10.9 (now 5.11), DM10.10 (now 5.15), DM8.12 (now 5.12)and DM8.13 (now 5.13) . | |
| 463486 | | | LP20151847 | Site NT031: This should have been used as a green alternative to a field in Seghill for nesting ground birds at Whitehouse Farm. Fir Tree Farm is the final agricultural land in the area, what happened to the need for open space and quality of life. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 807291 | | RESIDENT | LP20151866 | New site: put employment site towards Seaton Burn | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 591119 | | | LP20151885 | Site 109: I disagree with your claim that Indigo Park will attract "over a thousand jobs" . Your target employment on this site is Distribution warehousing. It is a known fact that this type of employment in the 21st century is very much automated (using AS/RS) and therefore requires minimum employees. As a result I believe your quoted figure is more imaginary than real. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Plan does not make reference to the amount of jobs to be generated on Indigo Park. The Council in a press release has indicated that the site has the capacity to generate over 1,000 jobs but this has not been used within the job projections of the Employment Land Review. | No amendments proposed. |
| 591119 | | | LP20151886 | Site 11 now Site E010: I object to your proposed usage of the land south of Greenhaugh, West Moor. The residents of West Moor have suffered much and often when it comes to the loss of open space. We have a strong and vibrant sense of community with the community centre at our hub. Please note that this facility is funded and run by the West Moor Residents Association using a | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | large number of volunteers and a small number of employees, paid for from funds raised by residents and not by the council. We have fought against previous suggestions of building on this land and have been assured that there will remain a buffer area between Quorum and Greenhaugh to prevent the joining-up of West Moor and Longbenton. We demand that this promise be kept and "" to use your words used in relation to Murton and Killingworth Village "" that you "PROTECT THE IDENTITY OF WEST MOOR VILLAGE AND PREVENT WEST MOOR MERGING WITH LONGBENTON" . | | | suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 591119 | | | LP20151887 | | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment blank - records have been checked against the online database which is also blank. Conclusion that comment record created as a duplicate error. | No amendments proposed. |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151916 | Site 109: Objection The development of this site when combined with the recently approved development to the south-east at Whitehouse Farm will effectively isolate Gosforth Park SSSI and Local Wildlife Sites to the east and north. Not only could this adversely impact upon a statutorily protected | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Local Authority has a responsibility to produce a Local Plan setting out future land allocations and policies that will guide planning decisions. The independent Employment Land Review (2015) was produced by a team of specialists who considered the existing | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>site (contrary to paragraph 118 of NPPF) but this would also have significant adverse effects upon the Wildlife Corridor, as such not meeting the requirements of paragraph 114 of NPPF to plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity. Site 109 also has populations of ground nesting birds (including farmland birds; BAP priority species). The unmitigated loss of this would impact upon the aims of the Local BAP. Site 109 is located on an important north-south wildlife corridor and therefore if planning positively for biodiversity and creating coherent ecological networks this site would not be allocated for development. For these reasons it is not appropriate to fully develop all of site 109. However we understand that the land is owned by the Council who wishes to make some money out of it and that there is already some business use in the area that was developed on brownfield land (former colliery). There is agreement on all sides that if Site 109 is to be developed then it should be accompanied by a master plan (it is potentially the largest proposed new employment site in the plan), which would replace the current (out-of-date) master plan and which would incorporate north-south wildlife corridors. We would accept this approach as being a compromise which will allow employment use and retain significant wildlife corridors. The plan should be amended to show that a master plan is required for Site 109 and that it will incorporate significant north-south wildlife corridors. The only alternative is to clearly</p> | | | <p>employment land and how much is required over the next 15 years to meet the levels of growth. The suggested sites in the consultation make provision for this predicted provision. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. National planning policy requires LPAs to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife and the Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Wildlife corridor designation does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including site layout and the proposed area for development. Policies S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now policy 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6) are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites are suggested for development in the Plan that have wildlife corridors running through them, the precise location of development within these sites has not been determined and the policies of the Plan highlights the need for wildlife corridors to be accommodated within future development. Council officer’s comment on site 109 was ‘Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality wildlife corridors</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | show the wildlife corridors (i.e. areas not to be developed) on the proposals map (as we have suggested above). This would also provide some actual evidence that the LPA is planning positively to create coherent ecological networks and achieve biodiversity gain (rather than ecological networks which run through development sites and are therefore not coherent!). | | | were not incorporated into any scheme'. | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151917 | Site 34: Objection This site is partly Local Wildlife Site and mitigation for the developments at Cobalt Business Park. There is little point in site mitigation if it is to be allocated for development further down the line. This ultimately does not mitigate for the permanent impacts of the previous development. Indeed it would be contrary to NPPF requirement for no net biodiversity loss. To develop the Local Wildlife site would be contrary to paragraph 110 of NPPF to "minimise" adverse effects on the local and natural environment, to paragraph 114 to "plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity" and to paragraph 117 of NPPF to "promote the preservation of or priority habitats" as this site supports neutral/basic semi-improved/unimproved grassland, a BAP habitat. It would also be in contradiction to the Local Plan policy S/8.4c to conserve and enhance Local Sites. We also note that this area of land provides important grassland habitats that complements the largely wooded adjacent Country Park and also provide an important ecological buffer. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. This site is not a designated Local Wildlife Site but does lie adjacent to the Silverlink biodiversity park so appropriate considerations to the neighbouring wildlife would need to be considered in accordance with the Local Plan e.g. Policies S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now policy 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6) | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151918 | Site 11 now Site E010: Objection The development on land allocated as an SLCI would be contrary to paragraph 110 to minimise€ adverse effects on the local and natural environment or paragraph 114 plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity. This site is also indicated as a wildlife corridor. We also note that this area is of semi-improved neutral grassland (potentially mitigation for an earlier residential development). This habitat is a Local BAP priority and to develop is would be contrary to policy S/8.4 in the Local Plan and to paragraph 117 of NPPF to "promote the preservation€ of priority habitats€ . For this reason we believe that it would be inappropriate to develop all of this site. The SLCI should not be developed and an east-west wildlife corridor retained across the site. This could be easily shown on the map (as we have suggested above). This would also provide some actual evidence that the LPA is planning positively to create coherent ecological networks and achieve biodiversity gain. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of | | LP20151919 | Site 9, now Site E008, : Objection We welcome that this site is no longer allocated for mixed-use. Due to proximity to Gosforth | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|----------------------------|
| | Northumbria | | | <p>Park SSSI and because this land has ecological value (from the scrub and rough grasslands that have established) the development of this site can not proceed without measures to compensate for biodiversity loss. The south-western part of this site is prone to flooding and as a result we believe that area to be inappropriate for development. However the flooded area would make a good biodiversity mitigation area to offset the development of the rest of site. For this to happen it needs to be planned for as part of a coherent ecological network. For this reason we believe that it would be inappropriate to develop all of this site and that a nature area at the southwest of the site should be created that links across the A189 to the wildlife corridor in adjacent Newcastle. This could be easily shown on the map (as we have suggested above). This would also provide some actual evidence that the LPA is planning positively to create coherent ecological networks and achieve biodiversity gain.</p> | | Employment Development | <p>North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | issues, will be clarified. |
| 805556 | | | LP20151977 | <p>Site 109: Indigo Park is welcomed but could another employment park be sited on the northern border ?</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. There are no new employment sites to be allocated north of Indigo Park but the existing employment sites in Seaton Burn and Dudley (Shasun) will remain in the Local Plan. Northumberland County Council are</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | promoting Northumberland Business Park, next to Moor Farm roundabout, for high quality office accommodation. | |
| 900788 | | DEVELOPER | LP20151988 | <p>Wallsend Road Industrial Area: Our client objects to the allocation of 146ha of general employment land (with a further 36ha of expansion land) as proposed under Policy S5.2 and- in particular- to the proposed inclusion of 1.55ha of employment land at Wallsend Road (NT006). This appears to be inconsistent with- and unduly bullish when considered in the context of- the three Growth Options set out in Section 7 of the Plan. The most ambitious of the three options, Growth Option A, generates a need for 953 homes per annum and is underpinned by an employment land requirement of "at least 60ha". Using the Council's own analysis, this requirement is estimated to correspond to 1 00ha less land than is currently available (Local Plan Consultation , Paragraph 7.18). On this basis, it is considered that the portfolio of land proposed under Policy S5.2 is inappropriately high and gives rise to an internal inconsistency in the Plan's strategy in relation to housing and employment. The text which precedes Policy S5.2 suggests that the Council's Employment Land Review (ELR) recommended the level of employment land provision proposed in Policy S5.2 (Local Plan Consultation , Paragraph 5.22). A review of the Council's 2015 ELR, raises further concerns regarding the scale of demand being planned for. Our clients concerns can be summarised as follows: The job growth scenarios considered within the ELR apply</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The numbers of jobs are based on the work of economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside. There are many contributing factors that have helped feed into the work on the ELR and it draws on the economic forecasts from the North East Local Economic Partnership. The ELR considers previous take up rates of employment land from an annual monitoring survey and considers the market perception of the Borough and market signals to indicate future demand in occupancy or investment. Site NT006, now Site E031, is still considered a suitable employment site and half the site is already occupied. The site is not considered to be an attractive site but this lends itself towards particular types of employment provision and its location is seen to be strategically important for future employment development. Its close proximity to existing established and growing industrial areas, next door to a facility that plays a strategic role of waste transfer within the Borough and also within the A19 economic corridor with excellent transport connections the site should be promoted for future economic development.</p> | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>simple pro-rata adjustments to baseline economic forecasts and job growth targets modelled at the LEP level. They are unlikely, therefore to fully and accurately reflect the growth trajectory and patterns of sectoral change anticipated in North Tyneside over the Plan period; and The ELR recommendation to plan for the land portfolio outlined in Policy S5.2 appears to have been derived from an unrealistically ambitious job growth scenario. Section 6.2.1 states that: "When comparing the 'High+' demand scenario (95.1ha) with the employment land supply (146ha) it is concluded that ... there is sufficient identified employment land to meet forecast demands." The High+ Scenario is understood to assume an increase of 26,163 jobs in North Tyneside over the Plan period -equivalent to 1,450 jobs per annum. This is significantly higher than past trends observed in North Tyneside. It is considered that, without detailed and robust evidence to the contrary, it is difficult to have confidence in the authority's ability to deliver growth on this scale. Having regard to the above, our client believes that it is likely to be more appropriate to plan for a lower level of demand for employment land, which better reflects local economic prospects. As a consequence, our client considers that scope exists to remove site NT006 (and possibly additional sites beyond this) in order to more closely align the demand for and supply of employment land. Site NT006 is vacant and scores poorly within the site assessment work undertaken to inform the Council's ELR. Indeed the ELR Site Survey Database states</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>that the wider industrial area is "not an attractive site, limited parking. Industrial buildings not in excellent condition ". The database indicates that the site has been assessed against twelve individual criteria, and was awarded a red or amber with respect to seven of them. Furthermore, Appendix D of the ELR provides a RAG (Red, Amber and Green) analysis and summary of initial recommendations on a site-by-site basis. This initially classifies site NT006 (Wallsend Road Industrial Area) as amber with a recommendation to "Retain/Release", whilst the majority of sites proposed for allocation in the table accompanying Policy S5.2 are classified as green with a recommendation to "Retain." This suggests that the decision regarding the future use of the site in question was a marginal one. In addition, there are two industrial estates of far superior quality located in close proximity to the site and providing more than 25ha of employment land. This is considered to represent sufficient employment land to meet needs in the immediately surrounding area over the Plan period: "ç The Tyne Tunnel Trading Estate (NT001) comprises of 17.25ha of general employment land, in addition to a further 7.11 ha of reserved land. The site was classified as green with respect to ten of the twelve assessment criteria. The Site Survey Database commented on the "very good" quality of the existing portfolio of premises and concluded that it is a "well established and growing industrial estate that is seen as important for future employment provision";</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | and "ç West Chirton North Trading Estate (NT003) comprises of 0.74ha of general employment land, in addition to a further 1.56ha of reserved land. The site was classified as green with respect to nine of the twelve assessment criteria in the Site Survey Database, which concluded that the location represents a "well established industrial estate. " | | | | |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152006 | Killingworth Moor - Policy S5.1 sets out the economic growth strategy for the plan period which the consortium broadly support whilst maintaining the right to undertake a further assessment of the quantum of land and sites identified for employment use under Policy S5.2. The consortium specifically supports recognition of the need for new office and business investment including national scale office development and the importance of the A19 corridor. Policy S5.1 "" Economic Growth Strategy In commenting on the Economic Growth Strategy, the consortium has considered the Employment Land Review 2014 (" ELR") and the content of the Local Plan. The consortium has not undertaken its own detailed assessment of the ELR or of the sites identified to be available for employment use for the plan period. They do, however, reserve the right to do so. Notwithstanding this, the consortium broadly supports the identification of 146 hectares of available employment land for the plan period (15 years) based on the evidence set out in the ELR. The employment land supply is set out in the Local Plan for the period of 2014 "" 2032 (18 years) yet that does not align with | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Employment Land Review (ELR) was undertaken in 2014 and covers the period of the Local Plan to 2032. The ELR provides a basis for an employment land trajectory for the next 18 years, covering the time taken for the Local Plan to be adopted (2017) and then 15 years thereafter. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the plan period set out in paragraph 3.1 of the local plan which suggests a 15 year period between adoption (circa 2016/17) and 2032. Based on a 15 year plan period the supply of 146 ha would equate to approximately 10 ha per annum which is in line with historic average land take up. It is noted that a further 36 hectares of reserved land is also available for the plan period, on top of the 146 ha of available land identified. Part of the 146 ha of supply is a single new allocation of employment land for 17 ha at Killingworth Moor (Site 26). This land falls within the consortium's control and is supported for inclusion in a masterplan to be prepared by the consortium in agreement with the Council. The location of employment land within the wider Killingworth Moor allocation under Policy AS7.4 is proposed to lie within easy proximity and access to the A19 but will be established within the agreed masterplan and is subject to ongoing assessment and evaluation of the site and surroundings. The consortium supports the allocation but reserves the right to identify a preferred location (within Killingworth Moor) and also an alteration to the overall quantum of employment subject to the outcome of the ongoing masterplanning of the site. In principle the consortium supports the location of the new employment at Killingworth Moor as it represents a strategically important location as an expansion to the A19 economic corridor (as shown on the proposals map) and is also well related for access not only onto the A19 but also to Northumberland Park</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>Metro via a link under the A19. In particular, Killingworth Moor offers the opportunity to provide a large scale site of strategic significance, adding to both the quality and quantity of employment land in the Borough. Well related to Cobalt, it represents a deliverable employment site in the plan period and at this stage a flexible employment allocation including B1, B2 and B8 uses should be applied, subject to any development being compatible with adjoining proposed housing. This will increase employment opportunities and retain more residents of the Borough also working in North Tyneside. As a major investor and developer within North Tyneside the Northumberland Estates is committed to delivery of the employment land within the plan period. It is noted from the ELR that a significant proportion of future demand for employment land will be for B1 uses, particularly B1 (a) offices. Given the successes of Cobalt and Quorum in delivering new B1 (a) office space the ELR identifies a need for further land for this use. The consortium considers that whilst not expressly stated within Policy S5.1, that the land at Killingworth Moor should be identified for B1(a) led development but that it should not be restricted only to that use and should include the potential for a range of business uses and some ancillary and complementary retail and potential small scale leisure uses.</p> | | | | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152028 | <p>Economic development is not restricted to planning for business uses and tourism but includes all aspects of commercial activity within the Local Authority. Notwithstanding</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment | <p>Comment noted. The numbers of jobs are based on the work of economic analysts who have produced an Employment Land Review (ELR) for North Tyneside. There are</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the effect that house building has on the economy, new economic development must be underpinned by sufficient housing to support the proposed level of job growth for the approach to be considered sustainable. Section 5 in paragraph 5.22 highlights the Council's intent to deliver 707 new jobs Per Annum across the plan period and that this is supported by the ELR. While this representation does not go into the details of deliverability for each site identified in policy S5.2 as stated above delivery of economic development should not just be a question of sufficient land available for that use. As stated later on in this representation there seems insufficient land or housing numbers planned for to sustain this level of economic growth at a viable and sustainable pace across the plan period. Given the aging demographic profile of the area and affordable housing requirement an annual target of 792 is far too low to sustain this level of economic growth. The Council's own preferred option for housing growth states that the planned 792 dwellings per annum will only support 654 jobs per annum. We would like to take the opportunity to identify this issue early and avoid the issues which were encountered during the recent Durham EIP process where the entire plan has been brought into question, we suggest that this is investigated more thoroughly and a revised housing figure or economic job figure proposed and ensure that the figures provided are both robust and defensible during an EIP process.</p> | | Development | <p>many contributing factors that have helped feed into the work on the ELR and it draws on the economic forecasts from the North East Local Economic Partnership. The ELR considers previous take up rates of employment land from an annual monitoring survey and considers the market perception of the Borough and market signals to indicate future demand in occupancy or investment. The housing growth has drawn upon a combination of forecasts and scenarios that are considered deliverable.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| 901015 | | RESIDENT | LP20152029 | Site 11 now Site E010: Adjacent to Proctor and Gamble I am writing to all 3 of you to register my deep concern regarding the proposed building on current green fields between Benton, Wallsend & Palmersville. Since I moved into this area 8 years ago the amount of building that has taken place has been quite extraordinary. This, together with the resultant loss of green space, the increase in traffic and the lack of appropriate infrastructure already struggling to cope with existing demands, means that the whole area is changing "" in my opinion "" for worse not for better. If you believe the current resident's opinions and wishes mean anything "" please do everything you can to stop this impingement on green field areas. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Site NT012/110 is currently an employment site, which is occupied by Proctor and Gamble. The remaining area of the employment site that is undeveloped is classified as reserved land, which is available solely as potential expansion land. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest sites for development, including those employment areas that are already developed, such as Site 11 now Site E010, whilst balancing many issues such as protecting and enhancing the natural environment and to enhance the image of the Borough. Wildlife interests are considered in Policy S8.1, DM8.2, DM8.4 and DM8.5 (now policy 5.1, 5.2 5.4, 5.5). The transport infrastructure will need to be capable of delivering the growth projections of the Local Plan and this has been considered within the transport modelling work that has led to £150million funding allocated for junction improvements over the next five years. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396238 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20152094 | New Site: Land to the North and West of Nixon's Kitchen lying between the A 1 and A 19 and adjacent to the Holiday Inn roundabout is in the Green Belt but has been a source of nuisance and misuse for many | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>years which has had to be dealt with by the Police and the Council. Ward Councillors were approached by the owner of the land with change of use proposal to use it for small industrial and manufacturing units. We understand that an outline business proposal has already been sent to the Council and we ourselves were given a plan. Without prejudice we have raised this informally with local people. Not only do those we have asked support this proposal from the point of view of local jobs but also feel it would put an end to the illegal use which they have had to put up with for many years. It is recognised that this is Green Belt land but having studied the Northumberland Local Plan where that Council is considering adding to their Green Belt land, could consideration be given to a reciprocal exchange approach to the Green Belt? It has been suggested by the Council that there is already enough land being proposed for Industrial use and this could have an impact on Indigo Park. We are led to believe the proposed Business Plan submitted by the site owner would provide for a different type of use with smaller units so would not be in conflict with other sites. In Newcastle's local Plan there are proposals for 400 houses to be built next to Brunswick Village (and we believe from local knowledge that movement is already in hand to start this development sooner than anticipated), a further 100 on Coach Lane in Hazlerigg and more recently a proposal for an extension to the Great Park of 5,000 houses. In the Northumberland Plan there are proposals for</p> | | | <p>the authority to plan for this growth. Having considered the extent of development required to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough, there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current Plan period without requiring a further review of the Green Belt to accommodate future provision.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | a further 3,000 houses immediately to the North of Seaton Burn. This will increase the demand for more job opportunities near to where these houses are to be built. I have also seen letters of support from the two existing successful business units next to where this land is situated. Without prejudice ward Councillors support this change of use. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152097 | RE New Site: Land to rear of Front Street, Seaton Burn. Supporting text to the policy (paragraph 5.20) highlights the need to identify a sufficient and flexible supply of land for economic development, which is attractive to new and existing businesses. Due to the unique location of our Client's site, it offers an attractive and deliverable opportunity to new and existing businesses which would contribute towards the delivery of the Council's strategy for economic prosperity and job growth. As such, it is considered that the site should be included as an employment allocation, delivering around 250,000 sq ft of employment floorspace. Support for employment uses at the site has been expressed by operators, including Nixons Kitchens (see Appendix 2). The site is assessed in the Council's recent Employment Land Review (ELR) (February 2015) for its potential as an employment location. The site (ELR reference 95) scores well against a number of site assessment criteria, including: strategic accessibility; local accessibility; and site characteristics & development constraints. It is also important to highlight that the ELR recognises that the site is "within a strategic location close to the A1 and A19" . | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary. Having considered the extent of development required to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough, there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current Plan period without requiring a further review of the Green Belt. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | This demonstrates the suitability of the site for employment uses. The site is regarded in the ELR to be unsuitable for employment use solely as a result of its location within the Green Belt. However, as discussed above, there is no justification for the site's inclusion within the Green Belt and exceptional circumstances exist to support its removal. Its removal from the Green Belt would release a site which provides an excellent employment opportunity within a strategic location to meet specific identified needs. | | | | |
| 808201 | | RESIDENT | LP20152109 | Site 11 now Site E010: Land at Whitehouse Farm to be developed by Bellway - Bell way are obliged to provide an alternative site for wildlife in accordance with their planning application. The land to replace the loss of farmland which was home to wildlife is to be relocated at Seghill. Could Site 11 now Site E010 not be marked for this thereby keeping an open space for wildlife in West Moor? Is it fair that West Moor loses green field sites and Seghill gains? Also see comment (3) below re Site 11 now Site E010. As the identities of Murton and Killingworth villages are to be protected from merging with others, so does the identity of West Moor need protecting to prevent merging with the surrounding communities. At the moment Site 11 is a farm/riding school with fields and provides the community (and the borough) with a popular leisure facility. Developing Site 11 now Site E010 will merge West Moor with Longbenton. At peak times the roads through West Moor, Salters Lane and Benton Lane are deadlocked with the traffic often backed up | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | from Killingworth right through to South Gosforth and beyond and Four Lane Ends and beyond. | | | not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152151 | Policy S5.2 - I would suggest the following amendment: ' ... taking into account[....] the potential for delivery to avoid or mitigate any impacts ' (see Policy S I 0.11) | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted, will amend as suggested. | "avoid or" added to criterion c. |
| 808545 | | RESIDENT | LP20152246 | Site 107: Why not develop this brown field site for housing? Not shown for development but good access to Earsdon bypass | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The site is occupied by Formica and contributes to the overall employment land provision within the Local Plan, thereby reducing pressure for employment development on Greenfield sites. Formica has developed the site as a specialist facility and is within the A19 economic corridor with excellent access to the strategic highway network. The land surrounding the site is classified as 'reserved land', which is recognition of the land being linked to the adjacent user and ensuring that if it is brought forward for development it is for an extension of the existing site. | No amendments proposed. |
| 589431 | | | LP20152251 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901392 | | RESIDENT | LP20152252 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901393 | | RESIDENT | LP20152253 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 469522 | | RESIDENT | LP20152254 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901394 | | RESIDENT | LP20152255 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901396 | | RESIDENT | LP20152256 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901397 | | RESIDENT | LP20152257 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. P.S. Please do not build those factories right up to the houses, the noise alone increases along with pollution. I used to feel that West Moor was quite rural but its sad to have those small special pastures built on, robbing lapwings etc... of their natural habitat. | | | identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 466426 | | | LP20152258 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 805559 | | | LP20152259 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901400 | | RESIDENT | LP20152260 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| 901401 | | RESIDENT | LP20152261 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |
| 901402 | | RESIDENT | LP20152262 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | Employment Development | <p>North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>issues, will be clarified.</p> |
| 901403 | | RESIDENT | LP20152263 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | | <p>is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | |
| 589431 | | | LP20152265 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901392 | | RESIDENT | LP20152266 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901393 | | RESIDENT | LP20152267 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 469522 | | RESIDENT | LP20152268 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901394 | | RESIDENT | LP20152269 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901396 | | RESIDENT | LP20152270 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901397 | | RESIDENT | LP20152271 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | space we have left. P.S. Please do not build those factories right up to the houses, the noise alone increases along with pollution. I used to feel that West Moor was quite rural but its sad to have those small special pastures built on, robbing lapwings etc... of their natural habitat. | | | movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 466426 | | | LP20152272 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 805559 | | | LP20152273 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | ecological evidence. | |
| 901400 | | RESIDENT | LP20152274 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| 901401 | | RESIDENT | LP20152275 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |
| 901402 | | RESIDENT | LP20152276 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | Employment Development | <p>North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>issues, will be clarified.</p> |
| 901403 | | RESIDENT | LP20152277 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | | <p>is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | |
| 901493 | | RESIDENT | LP20152278 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901509 | | | LP20152281 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901493 | | RESIDENT | LP20152279 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901495 | | RESIDENT | LP20152280 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901495 | | RESIDENT | LP20152282 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901497 | | RESIDENT | LP20152284 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901497 | | RESIDENT | LP20152285 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | space we have left. | | | movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901509 | | | LP20152283 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901510 | | RESIDENT | LP20152288 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| 588467 | West Moor Residents' Association | | LP20152286 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |
| 588467 | West Moor Residents' Association | | LP20152287 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | Employment Development | <p>North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>issues, will be clarified.</p> |
| 461188 | | RESIDENT | LP20152290 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | | <p>is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | |
| 461188 | | RESIDENT | LP20152291 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901510 | | RESIDENT | LP20152289 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901512 | | RESIDENT | LP20152294 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 461393 | | RESIDENT | LP20152292 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 461393 | | RESIDENT | LP20152293 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901499 | | RESIDENT | LP20152295 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901499 | | RESIDENT | LP20152296 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | space we have left. | | | movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901512 | | RESIDENT | LP20152297 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 805597 | | | LP20152298 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| 805597 | | | LP20152299 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |
| 901514 | | RESIDENT | LP20152302 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | Employment Development | <p>North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>issues, will be clarified.</p> |
| 901500 | | RESIDENT | LP20152300 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | | <p>is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | |
| 901500 | | RESIDENT | LP20152301 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901501 | | RESIDENT | LP20152303 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901501 | | RESIDENT | LP20152304 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901514 | | RESIDENT | LP20152305 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901502 | | RESIDENT | LP20152306 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901502 | | RESIDENT | LP20152307 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901505 | | RESIDENT | LP20152308 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | space we have left. | | | movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901505 | | RESIDENT | LP20152309 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 594633 | | | LP20152310 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| 901516 | | RESIDENT | LP20152312 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |
| 594633 | | | LP20152311 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | Employment Development | <p>North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>issues, will be clarified.</p> |
| 458324 | | | LP20152313 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | | <p>is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | |
| 458324 | | | LP20152315 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901516 | | RESIDENT | LP20152314 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | | <p>protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | |
| 805568 | | | LP20152316 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 805568 | | | LP20152317 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 461997 | | | LP20152318 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 461997 | | | LP20152319 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 805705 | | | LP20152320 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | space we have left. | | | movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 805705 | | | LP20152321 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901520 | | RESIDENT | LP20152322 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| 901520 | | RESIDENT | LP20152323 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |
| 901521 | | RESIDENT | LP20152324 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | Employment Development | <p>North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>issues, will be clarified.</p> |
| 901521 | | RESIDENT | LP20152325 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | | <p>is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | |
| 901522 | | RESIDENT | LP20152326 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | | <p>suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | |
| 901522 | | RESIDENT | LP20152327 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 592320 | | | LP20152328 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 592320 | | | LP20152329 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901523 | | RESIDENT | LP20152330 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901523 | | RESIDENT | LP20152331 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901524 | | RESIDENT | LP20152332 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | space we have left. | | | movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901524 | | RESIDENT | LP20152333 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901525 | | RESIDENT | LP20152334 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| 901525 | | RESIDENT | LP20152335 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |
| 901526 | | RESIDENT | LP20152336 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | Employment Development | <p>North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | <p>issues, will be clarified.</p> |
| 901526 | | RESIDENT | LP20152337 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | | <p>is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | |
| 901528 | | RESIDENT | LP20152338 | <p>Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left.</p> | | | <p>suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence.</p> | |
| 901528 | | RESIDENT | LP20152339 | <p>Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in</p> | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | <p>Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also</p> | <p>Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901530 | | RESIDENT | LP20152340 | Site 11 now Site E010: I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 901530 | | RESIDENT | LP20152341 | Site 9, now Site E008, : I wish to make the following objection to proposals for development in the Local Plan Consultation 2015 in and around West Moor, in the North West of the County. Site 11 now Site E010 on the plan (adjacent to Quorum) is marked as available employment land, yet a closer site inspection would show it to be a site of Local Wildlife Importance and a site of beauty and significance to local people. Building here would destroy the green corridor between West Moor and Quorum and would result in them merging into each other. Since the preservation of local identity is such a priority in Murton and Killingworth in the plan, we wonder why, the people of West Moor cannot be afforded the same privileges. We would also like to highlight the sensitivity of land at | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as Site 9, now Site E008, & 11, now Site E010) , but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. As part of the review of the Local Plan, physical constraints and/or other designations, which restrict the size of a site, will be shown on the Policies Map and | Site allocations on the Policies Map with constraints and/or other issues, will be clarified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | Point 9 on the map which is adjacent to an SSSI site of conservational importance (in Newcastle) and serves as habitat for many rare species spilling out of the site. Our area in the north west will see enormous amounts of development in the forthcoming years due to existing commitments that will result in large increases in traffic and pollution and we wish to vigorously protect what little green space we have left. | | | in the site analysis. This will provide a more accurate picture of the overall development proposed. The Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI) to the north of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) will be protected for its biodiversity value. Wildlife corridors do not outline a defined boundary for future wildlife provision on a site but it does identify the importance of wildlife movement through a site. The designation of a wildlife corridor would require a development proposal to maintain and enhance the network of wildlife sites and links between them with the appropriate ecological evidence. | |
| 898630 | | | LP20152388 | Site 11 now Site E010: Proctor and Gamble - Objection Petition against proposals to build on the last remaining green fields in Benton and Wallsend. Petition objects to the proposed allocation of sites 17, 111, 139, and 110 for housing and industrial development, as outlined in the latest version of the Local Plan. Sites 111 and 139 have been added since the last consultation and planning permission has already been granted for East Benton Rise and various other developments in the area. As of 3pm 27th March, the petition contains 953 signatures. They were obtained in a very short space of time and with little organised effort. The number and type of comments demonstrate the depth of feeling and concern over this particular issue. The comments cover a wide range of issues that are categorised below. They apply to sections 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10 of your proposals in the local plan: A range of additional | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and ecological networks, e.g. Policy AS7.4 (now split into 4.4a-c), S8.1 (now 5.1), DM8.2(now 5.2), DM8.4 (now 5.4) and DM8.5(now5.5). Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary therefore conserving rural land within the Borough (Policy S1.5). The | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>comments in support of the petition were made and can be viewed online through the attachment to this comment. Comment - Loss of green space - number of references - 275 Comment - Traffic/Infrastructure - number of references - 134 Comment - Over/inappropriate/disjointed development of the area - number of references - 79 Comment - Loss of wildlife - number of references - 45 Comment - Quality of Life - number of references - 43 Comment - Preservation for future generations - number of references - 35 Comment - Council will not listen - number of references - 15 Comment - Schools/Health - number of references - 13 Comment - Flooding - number of references - 12 Comment - Other - number of references - 9 In light of the above, I, and 952 others, hope you will reconsider your proposals for building on what is the last remaining green space in the area and retain them as green space.</p> | | | <p>importance of health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S10.13 (now 7.10) 'Community Infrastructure' and Policy S10.1 (now 7.1) 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers and health officials to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on the area. The Employment Land Review (ELR) was recently updated (2015) and forms an important part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. The ELR considers which areas of employment land are likely to see future demand in occupancy or investment. All these factors are considered in the future provision of employment land in the Local Plan so that it is able to accommodate future investment. Site NT012/110 is currently an employment site, which is occupied by Proctor and Gamble. The remaining area of the employment site that is undeveloped is classified as reserved land, which is available solely as potential expansion land. The transport infrastructure will be developed in the future Masterplan for Murton and Killingworth, but the traffic impacts from the amount of economic growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. The Council tried to make as many people aware of the consultation as possible so they can make a contribution to the preparation of the Local Plan and the</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Council magazine 'Our North Tyneside' is meant to be distributed to every home in the Borough. The Local Plan Consultation Statement is available on the Council and provides a record of consultation responses received. Flooding is an issue that is covered by Policy DM8.12, S10.9 and DM10.10 in the Local Plan – Policy DM8.12 (now 5.12) states 'All developments will be required to demonstrate that flood risk does not increase as a result of the development proposed, and that options have been taken to reduce overall flood risk from all sources, taking into account the impact of climate change over its lifetime. All new development should contribute positively to actively reducing flood risk in line with national policy, through avoidance, reduction, management and mitigation'. | |
| 901791 | Maclean Electrical | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152421 | NEW Site: Land to the rear of Front Street, Seaton Burn I can confirm that we have no issues with the proposed use of the land detailed for either commercial or industrial use. At present we have no plans to extend our existing premises but this may be something we are required to look at in the future, and we would certainly look to maintain our presence within the community at our current location as opposed to moving elsewhere. | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment Development | Comment noted. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional circumstances exist to amend its boundary. Having considered the extent of development required to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough, there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current Plan period without requiring a further review of the Green Belt. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901792 | Nixon Kitchens (Roundel Manufactu | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152422 | NEW Site: Land to the rear of Front Street, Seaton Burn We are happy to confirm that we would have no objection to the proposed use of the land at the north and west of our own | | S 5.2 Provision of Land for Employment | Comment noted. Having undertaken an assessment of the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside, it is determined that no exceptional | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | ring Ltd.) | | | property being allocated for industrial/commercial use. Indeed we believe that it would afford us some additional security over what we currently have. We are in the process of completing an extension to the existing factory on our site which has used up all of our land. Releasing this land from it's current use may also be of benefit to us in allowing us to consider expanding our operation further if this was permitted to proceed rather than us having to consider moving production to our larger facility in Washington, Tyne & Wear at some date in the future. This would not be something that we would lightly consider as we value highly the different methods of production at each facility. | | Development | circumstances exist to amend its boundary. Having considered the extent of development required to 2032 and the capacity of existing Safeguarded Land in the Borough, there remains sufficient land to meet the development needs of the Borough for at least the current Plan period without requiring a further review of the Green Belt. | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151335 | Policy DM5:3 Development affecting employment land and buildings. CPRE can support this policy. | | DM 5.3 Development Affecting Employment Land and Buildings | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900788 | | DEVELOPER | LP20151989 | Our client welcomes the positive wording of Policy DM5.3 which allows proposals to come forward for alternative uses on identified Employment Land, providing they would satisfy the four criteria (ad). Whilst our client supports policy criteria (b) (c) and (d), the wording of policy criteria (a) is deemed to be fundamentally contradictory to the purpose of DM5.3, which seeks to enable flexibility in the use of employment land whilst ensuring that developments support the overall growth and prosperity of North Tyneside. As it stands, applications for alternative uses could be | | DM 5.3 Development Affecting Employment Land and Buildings | Comment noted. The Policy seeks to ensure that applications on employment land are considered on the basis of their impact on the economic prosperity of North Tyneside and allowing flexibility for other employment uses outside of the planning use classes of B1, B2 and B8. Criteria (a) should be retained as it is reasonable to consider the impact of an application which would harm the regeneration or development of employment sites for economic development. NPPF paragraph 14 makes it clear that the Local Authorities | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | considered to fail to satisfy policy criteria (a) as the loss of an employment site would by definition harm the development of employment sites. This loss should be considered against the overall supply and need for employment land in the Borough. As set out above, policy criteria (a) does not enable flexibility in line with DM5.3 and is also contradictory to NPPF Paragraphs 14 and 22. As such, we recommend that policy criteria (a) is removed. | | | should seek opportunities to meet the development needs of its area and paragraph 22 also states that land allocations should be reviewed regularly. The policy is supporting the provision of development needs that have been identified in the Borough and these policies will need to be reviewed along with evidence to ensure that the Plan is being delivered. | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151336 | Policy DM5:4 Clause c) should include provision of public transport and active travel options as well as vehicular (car) access. Green travel plans could be required. This would be in line with the sustainability appraisal carried out for the sites identified in S5:2 | | DM 5.4 Employment Land Development Outside Identified or Existing Employment Land | Comment noted. The Policy will be amended to include reference to sustainable transport connections. | Policy DM5.4 (now Policy DM2.4) criteria (c) amended - 'Can be provided with appropriate vehicular access, and supports access to sustainable transport connections, and' |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152152 | Policy DM5.4(d)- development should not be contrary to other plan policies or objectives. | | DM 5.4 Employment Land Development Outside Identified or Existing Employment Land | Comment noted. The Local Plan should be read as a whole and therefore the wording in criteria (d) will be amended. | Wording in criteria (d) 'or otherwise be contrary to other policies within this Local Plan' will be deleted as the Local Plan is to be read as a whole and therefore does not need to refer to any contradiction with other policies in the Plan |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151337 | Policy AS5:5 CPRE can support this policy but is concerned about the danger of internationally protected wildlife sites pointed out in para 5:35. | | AS 5.5 River Tyne North Bank | Comments noted. The potential effects on international sites is noted, hence the reference to policy DM8.6 (now Policy DM5.6) that sets out the requirement for appropriate avoidance or mitigation of, or compensation for, any adverse effects. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 805615 | Lambert Smith Hampton | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151654 | It is also acknowledged that the "River Tyne North Bank' Policy AS5.5 has expanded to support proposals for all forms of employment development that will "enable economic growth, investment and regeneration of the area where they do not restrict riverside access that could compromise the capacity of the River Tyne North Bank to support marine and off-shore related industry'. This addition is welcomed by the Port as it again more generally supports economic growth and traditional business and Port activities in the area. Whilst the policy goes onto particularly encourage and support development and investment in advanced engineering, manufacturing and renewables sector, with particular reference to the Port of Tyne as part of the North East Low Carbon Enterprise Zone, it is acknowledged that this reflects the work of the Council and its stakeholders in recent years and does not preclude other economic development at the Port. | | AS 5.5 River Tyne North Bank | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151938 | Natural England supports the requirement of this policy to be compliant with policy DM8.6 in order to ensure that there are no adverse effects on internationally designated sites. | | AS 5.5 River Tyne North Bank | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152153 | Paragraph 5.35- this policy has the potential to cause harm to the historic environment. This issue could be addressed if Policy AS5.5 were directed to also promote Segedunum and the World Heritage Site as a means of contributing to economic growth and regeneration. | | AS 5.5 River Tyne North Bank | Comments noted. This policy supports development and investment in employment uses at the River Tyne North Bank, which is part of the Northeast Local Enterprise Zone. A further policy in the Plan "Wallsend: Segedunum Roman Fort and Hadrian's Wall WHS" provides support to the protection, enhancement and promotion of the WHS. The Plan also | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | includes a suite of policies that support the preservation and enhancement of heritage assets. The Plan will be implemented as a whole. | |
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015463 | We also note the cross-river A19(T) Tyne Tunnels and Shields Ferry strategic infrastructure connections, and the River Tyne wildlife corridor illustrated on Maps 1 and 2. However, there appears to be no mention in the Plan document or on its accompanying Policies Map of the strategic Grade II-listed cross-river pedestrian-cycle tunnels. In this context we support the associated A19(T) Economic Corridor Policy AS/5.6 and supporting text, together with the need to enhance road and public transport infrastructure throughout this strategic growth corridor. We would suggest it may be useful to illustrate this corridor on one of the planar€™s introductory maps. | | AS 5.6 A19(T) Economic Corridor | Comment noted. The planning team will review the opportunity to illustrate the A19(T) Economic Corridor on a Map in the Plan, but it is identified on the Policies Map. The pedestrian and cycle tunnels are specifically referred to in paragraph 2.18 with emphasis on the links they provide to both North and South Tyneside. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805615 | Lambert Smith Hampton | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151655 | It is our understanding that Policy AS5.6 "A19 Economic Corridor' no longer extends to cover the Port's land holdings at Morston, Howdon Yard and land to the east. This is welcomed given that the policy retains its focus on office development and that the Port's land interests are now adequately covered by policies S5.1 and AS5.5 and need not be included within this policy. | | AS 5.6 A19(T) Economic Corridor | Comment noted. The Ports Land holdings at Morston and Howdon Yards are covered by policy AS5.6 (now Policy S2.6), but also Policy S5.1 (now Policy S2.1) and Policy AS5.5 (now Policy S2.5). It must be stressed that the other policies in the Local Plan would need to be considered depending on the future development plans for the site and Policy AS5.6 (now Policy S2.6) does specify that a mix of employment uses would be prioritised and not just offices for the areas towards the south of the A19. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900788 | | DEVELOPER | LP20151990 | Our client broadly supports the Council's aspiration to promote and support further development and investment in a range of B 1, B2 and B8 employment activities across the | | AS 5.6 A19(T) Economic Corridor | Comment noted. The boundary of the A19 economic corridor will be considered as the Plan progresses to the next stage of consultation but currently the sites to south | Policies Map amended so that it includes the transport areas of the proposed Metro route and |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>A 19 (T) economic corridor, as identified on the Policies Map. In addition, our client also understands that the A 19 (T) economic corridor will continue to play a central role in growth in employment in North Tyneside over the life of the plan. However, the boundary of the A 19 (T) economic corridor, as identified on the Policies Map should be amended. Specifically, the south-east boundary of the A 19 (T) economic corridor which currently incorporates a residential area, community allotments and our client's site, should be removed from the designation to ensure conformity with the objectives of policy AS5.6. The eastern boundary should be brought in to align with Alnwick Avenue; should then follow the wagon way (southwards) down to the A 193; and should then follow the A 193 (westwards) until it intersects with the A 187. The boundary should then follow the A 187 southwards. There are sufficient sites already identified in the A 19 (T) economic corridor to deliver the planned growth, which are more suitable for economic purposes than our client's site. In this context, we request that this site is removed from this designation. The suggested amendments will allow the A 19 (T) economic corridor to be supported by defensible boundaries and will ensure accordance with the objectives of policy AS5.6 by removing sites that are not needed for economic development.</p> | | | of the A193 and east of the A187 are identified for future employment provision in the Employment Land Review (2015) and Policy AS5.6 (now PolicyS2.6) would also be applicable to the area identified. | the employment land at Killingworth. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152030 | This Rep details a policy that does not exist but relates to Policy DM5.7 hence it has been input into this category: DM/4.6: Employment | | DM 5.7 Employment and Skills | Comment noted. The policy will be reviewed and amendments considered. | The policy has been moved to the infrastructure section of the Local Plan |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | and Skills: The house building industry represents a significant local employer and contributes substantially to the local economy. As such, whilst encouraging recruitment and skills opportunities through development is welcomed, the LPA's approach of incorporating this as a requirement of the Local Plan is not considered to be appropriate. The proposed policy is not considered to meet the legal tests associated with section 106 agreements in the CIL Regulations "" namely that it should be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. We therefore object to its inclusion and advise its removal from the plan. | | | | and the Policy has been re-worded. First line 'will be required' has been deleted and the final sentence amended to read - 'applicants are encouraged to agree measures with the Council to achieve this, which could include:' |
| 878767 | | | LP201518 | Paragraph 7.82 states that "The aim is to reduce the concentration of these developments (Residential Institutions) to support Whitley Bay to become a sustainable community." Policy statement AS5.8 should therefore be amended to reflect this stated aim by noting that "The change of use of existing visitor accommodation (C1 hotel/guest house) to become Residential Institutions will not generally be permitted." This would then also support the long term aims for developing the Coast. | | AS 5.8 Tourism and Visitor Accommodation at the Coast | Comments noted. The Plan will be implemented as a whole. Policies AS7.1 (now S4.1)3 (now Policy AS8.21) and AS5.8 (now Policy AS8.16) will be implemented in tandem and need not duplicate their aims. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805724 | | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015274 | Support expressed generally for the policy and its reasoned justification. | | AS 5.8 Tourism and Visitor Accommodation at the Coast | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 814591 | | | LP2015343 | Any plans for a caravan/motorhome site somewhere near the ferry terminus? A great | | AS 5.8 Tourism and | Comment noted. The Local Plan does recognise the economic benefits to the | Policy S5.1 (now PolicyS2.1) to be amended |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | spot for incoming and outgoing travellers to base themselves while they do the local sights. | | Visitor Accommodation at the Coast | Borough from leisure and tourism Policy S5.1, (now Policy S2.1), but there is no land allocated for a caravan/motor home site near the ferry terminus. Policy S5.1 (now Policy S2.1) will be reviewed to consider greater emphasis on supporting tourism development associated with the International Ferry Terminal. | so criteria (a) (ii) refers to the international ferry terminal |
| 797386 | | | LP20151047 | It is vital to sort out the Dome funding issues and turn it into a magnet for locals and tourists. A successful use of the Dome will attract better bars, restaurants and shops to the area...and will increase the use of local hotels and B&Bs. This will also have a positive effect on the attractiveness of NT to other businesses. I believe that the Council and Mayor have worked hard to make progress with the Dome and a final push, with the help of local residents and businesses, may now be necessary. | | AS 5.8 Tourism and Visitor Accommodation at the Coast | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151939 | Natural England supports the requirement of this policy to be compliant with policy DM8.6 in order to ensure that there are no adverse effects on internationally designated sites. | | AS 5.8 Tourism and Visitor Accommodation at the Coast | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152155 | Policy AS5.8 - I would suggest the following additional wording: '(c)(iii) without causing unjustified harm to, or loss of, the significance of any heritage assets.' | | AS 5.8 Tourism and Visitor Accommodation at the Coast | Comments noted. However we feel that the policies set out in the heritage assets chapter, that are applicable to all policies/proposals within the Plan, provide adequate protection to heritage assets. The natural environment receives particular mention in this policy due to the internationally-important features that are specific to the coast. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 890843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015158 | Support development of amenities at seafront and need better car parking (e.g. at seaside). | | AS 5.9 Visitor Attractions and Activities at the Coast | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805724 | | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015275 | Support expressed for the policy and in particular criterion b which refers to new visitor facilities on St Mary's Headland. Acknowledging that St Mary's Headland is within Green Belt, it is suggested that the reasoned justification to the policy is expanded to address the interrelationship between policies. For discussion purposes the following is suggested;"The opportunities to enhance tourism at the Coast with new visitor facilities at St Mary's Headland will be afforded significant positive weight in the application of Green Belt policy and assessment of very special circumstances". | | AS 5.9 Visitor Attractions and Activities at the Coast | Support noted and the points raised will be considered as the Local Plan is progressed and we shall keep you informed of the progress and any subsequent changes to the Local Plan. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894718 | | RESIDENT | LP2015439 | More leisure and culture facilities in the culture leisure quarter around The Dome (1st priority) - e.g. new ice rink and bowling alley, TGI Fridays, hotel, events on The Links with Dome, dancing, classy bars and theatre. The Empress and Dome for dancing and events. Don't waste opportunities! | | AS 5.9 Visitor Attractions and Activities at the Coast | Comment noted. The Council are working to regenerate Spanish City with a view that the regeneration benefits of the Dome spread to the wider Whitley Bay area. Policy AS1.5 (now Policy AS8.15) and Policy AS9.16 (now Policy AS8.18) both seek to reflect this and diversify the culture and leisure offer around the Dome and Policy AS6.6 (now Policy AS8.20) seeks to support the work to tackle some of the problems associated around South Parade . | No amendments proposed. |
| 894746 | | RESIDENT | LP2015446 | Bring companies 1st and leisure and culture - classy bars for drink and meal, theatre, dancing and events | | AS 5.9 Visitor Attractions and Activities at the Coast | Comment noted. The Council are working to regenerate the Coast with a view that the regeneration benefits of the Dome spread to the wider area. Policy AS5.9 (now Policy AS8.17), Policy AS1.5 (now Policy AS 8.15) and Policy AS9.16 (now Policy AS8.18) seek to reflect this and diversify the culture and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | leisure offer available and Policy AS6.6 (now Policy AS8.20) seeks to support the work to tackle some of the problems associated around South Parade . | |
| 895180 | | RESIDENT | LP2015515 | Should follow beach front idea like Barcelona where shops, showers and deckchairs are available. | | AS 5.9 Visitor Attractions and Activities at the Coast | Comment noted. The Council is keen to see the regeneration of the coast and the Local Plan reflects this in Policy AS1.5 (now Policy 8.15) and Policy AS5.9 (now Policy AS8.17). The Local Plan does support proposals to revitalise the coast with a high quality of public realm Policy AS1.5, (now Policy AS8.15) so that it attracts visitors to the area with shops and other attractions at Spanish City Policy AS9.16, (now Policy AS8.18). | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151339 | Policy AS5:9. CPRE can support this policy provided that wildlife sites and corridors are adequately protected. | | AS 5.9 Visitor Attractions and Activities at the Coast | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151940 | Natural England supports the requirement of this policy to be compliant with policy DM8.6 in order to ensure that there are no adverse effects on internationally designated sites. | | AS 5.9 Visitor Attractions and Activities at the Coast | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 889885 | | RESIDENT | LP201549 | I live in Longbenton and have the following thoughts which not only affect me locally but throughout the borough: - Improved street cleaning especially to remove broken glass were drunken yobs have smashed their bottles. - Less shops selling cheap alcohol - there are 2 in the local shopping centre a matter of yards from each other. - Resurfacing of pavements. As a cyclist, and this also applies to dog walkers, items 1 and 3 above cause many issues. I know at times of cost cutting these may be low priority but item 2 could ease item 1. Also, if any area is well maintained it may encourage the public to | | S 6.1 Competitive Centres | Comment noted. The Local Plan aims to support competitive town centres (Policy 6.1) and support development that contributes to an improved town centre environment and reduce the fear of crime. Issues of street cleaning, resurfacing of pavements and the price of alcohol being sold in shops is not a planning matter. However, I have raised your concerns with the Street Cleansing Team (Wendy Brown) who I am sure will look into issues of broken glass in Longbenton shopping centre. If you have future concerns there is link on the Council website which may be helpful to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | keep it that way. | | | report untidy street or overflowing litter bins - http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/403/report-untidy-streets-and-overflowing-litter-bins | |
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015469 | We note North Tyneside's strategic aspirations and updated assessed needs for growth in policies S5.1-5.2, S6.1-6.3 and S7.1 (now S4.1)-7.2 plus DM7.6, | | S 6.1 Competitive Centres | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898920 | Sustrans | | LP2015981 | Residential development within town and district centres in particular adjacent to or on top of Tyne & Wear Metro stations should be encouraged. Car free development has successfully been permitted in dense urban locations elsewhere in the UK and would be appropriate for a number of transit rich locations in North Tyneside. | | S 6.1 Competitive Centres | Comment noted. The Local Plan does not recognise residential development as a main town centre use but it does acknowledge its importance to a healthy and vibrant town centre. The Local Plan advocates this in Policy DM6.4 (now 3.4) criteria (b) 'Promote the vitality and viability of the centre, including proposals for residential development and conversion of upper floors.' | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151252 | S6.1 Competitive Centres Our Client supports the Consultation Document Policy S6.1. This comment relates mainly to: "ç a. 'Contribution to the protection and enhancement of the vitality and viability of the centre'; and "ç f. "Enhance accessibility by all modes including public transport, walking cycling and by car'. If town centres are clean, safe and easily accessible local people are likely to use their local town centre for services. All existing and new residential development should have safe and suitable access to their local town centre through sustainable modes of transportation, giving local people the choice of how to travel, for example: if they do not have a car, or they would like to walk or they choose to travel by | | S 6.1 Competitive Centres | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | car due to weather conditions or for time saving. Therefore, if enhanced accessibility is created local people are likely to use their local town centre, which in turn will protect and further enhance the vitality and viability of the centre, due to increased local expenditure. It also makes the area a more vibrant place to want to live, work, invest or carry out leisure activities. The NPPF (22) suggests that town centres should be at the heart of communities and that residential development can play an important role in ensuring vitality of centres, where residential development is encouraged on appropriate sites. | | | | |
| 898630 | | | LP20151271 | I'm afraid that I don't see what you are actually going to do to help these areas apart from set aside land for more development. In my area, Forest Hall, there are plenty of empty shops, and I know one, the café, closed because of a combination of a rent increase and high business rates. I'd like to see what practical measures you will implement to help fill empty shops. There are now no shops in Forest Hall that have a toilet The public convenience is not open for very long, so people who might linger are less likely to do so, which affects footfall. Also, turn the office building in Forest Hall into flats, that would help with housing and be a boost the shopping area. | | S 6.1 Competitive Centres | Comment noted. The Local Plan supports residential development in town centres to promote the vitality and viability of centres and the conversion of the upper floors to residential (Policy DM6.4 now 3.4), but rental levels or business rates are not a planning matter. The Council has recently invested in some improvements to Forest Hall with the intention to improve the public realm to try and create an environment people are more likely to visit and therefore create opportunities for new investment. Planning can support this work but ultimately the decisions to invest in a centre are market led. | No amendments proposed |
| | | | LP20151404 | I object to the development and building of out of town retail parks. These will kill our town centres. Killing off town centres is contrary to your policies on community building. I would like to see the Town Centres | | S 6.1 Competitive Centres | Comments noted. The National Planning Policy Framework states Local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses that | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | revitalised and promoted as lively, busy, cheery hubs where people want to spend time and shop. | | | are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan. They should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale. | |
| 899323 | | | LP20151601 | As per our previous representations, NewRiver Retail is encouraged by the Council's priorities for growth and investment as set out in Policy S6.1 and supports town centre redevelopment which would "support the improvement in the range and quality of shops, services and facilities" . Our Client supports the Council's commitment to deliver regeneration and investment "to improve the overall quality of retail provision" including the recognition that encouraging for the growth of evening economy (including leisure, culture and arts) will improve the economic position of the town centre. We are however concerned that the reference to town centres, present in the 2013 , has been removed from Policy S6.1. Our Client considers that this reference should be reinstated to comply with the "'town centres first' approach of the Government and to address the need for investment in North Tyneside€™s town | | S 6.1 Competitive Centres | Comment noted. The Policy has only seen minor tweaks since the 2013 version and it is not considered to have diminished the Councils commitment to a town centre first approach of the Local Plan | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--|------------|--|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | centres, particularly North Shields and Wallsend, as discussed in Paragraph 6.7. | | | | |
| 396253 | Northumb erland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151920 | The Northumberland Estates broadly support the Council's overarching strategy for pursuing the growth of the Borough's defined centres, and in particular their support for the improvement of the range and quality of shops, services and facilities. | | S 6.1 Competitive Centres | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNME NT AGENCY | LP20151941 | Natural England would encourage a reference to policy DM8.6 in relation to this policy to ensure that it is compliant with the Habitats Regulations. The measures listed would encourage visitors to the competitive centres which in the case of Whitley Bay is adjacent to the Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar and Northumberland Shore SSSI and therefore the indirect effects of this policy in combination with those policies that encourage visitors to the coast should be considered in your Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and SA. | | S 6.1 Competitive Centres | Comment noted, reference to policy DM8.6 will be added. Please note DM8.6 has been renumbered to 5.6. | "This policy has been identified as having the potential to cause adverse impacts on internationally protected wildlife sites. When implemented, regard should be had to policy DM5.6 that sets out the requirement for appropriate avoidance or mitigation of, or compensation for, any adverse effects." added at 11.51 |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNME NT AGENCY | LP20152157 | Policy S6.1 - I welcome support for schemes which capitalise on the character, distinctiveness and heritage value of the Borough's town centres. | | S 6.1 Competitive Centres | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/R EGIONAL/OR GANISATION | LP20151342 | Policy DM6:10 CPRE is concerned that this policy should be as robust and stringent as NPPF will allow. Clause d) is counter-intuitive: one of the sequential tests justifying an out-of-town centre is surely poor access to an existing town centre. Good access and connections to an out-of-town centre from a failing town centre is likely to drain further trade from the town centre. Clauses g and h) should explicitly refer to adverse impact on | | DM 6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development | Comment noted. The Council is promoting a town centre first approach to revitalise its town centres in accordance with the NPPF. Clause (d) is a reflection of NPPF paragraph 24 'When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre'. Clause (g) and (h) make specific reference to committed and planned public and private | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | projects regenerating existing town centres. | | | investment in a centre or centres, but deliberately not being explicit to certain regeneration projects so the policy can be flexible and therefore applicable to future projects over the lifetime of the Local Plan (15 years) that are not yet developed. | |
| 899323 | | | LP20151605 | <p>We consider that the Council should take every opportunity of revising the Borough's planning policy framework to ensure long term sustainable growth of the established town centres. This should be executed by applying the below policy provisions required by the NPPF: i. The NPPF promotes a town centre first approach and seeks that planning policies should promote competitive town centres which are attractive to the whole community as places to work, shop and visit. Paragraph 23 of the NPPF requires that in drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should recognise town centres as the heart of their communities and pursue policies to support their viability and vitality. The NPPF further requires that where town centres are in decline, local planning authorities should plan positively for their future to encourage economic activity (Paragraph 23). Page 3 of 7 i. The new Local Plan should further require a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre that are not in an existing centre. Applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out-of-centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out-of-centre proposals, preference should be given</p> | | DM 6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development | <p>The Council adopts a town centre first approach in the Local Plan and this is reflected in its objectives and policies. The Local Plan seeks to deliver the objective to 'revitalise its town centres' and support the protection and enhancement of the vitality and viability of its centres. The Local Plan has a specific policy for each town centre (except for Killingworth), with the intention to provide confidence and direct future regeneration to its centres. The Local Plan adheres to the guidance provided in NPPF for applying the sequential test and the Council has adopted a locally set floorspace threshold for an impact assessment, based on the evidence in the updated Retail and Leisure Study (2014). There is no evidence to justify a lower threshold for determining impact of convenience floorspace than the level proposed. The local floorspace threshold for North Tyneside is a reflection of the Councils intention to ensure that future planning applications reflect the local market conditions in its centres that are of a smaller scale than the national thresholds. The details of the recent planning application for the Travelodge site on the Silverlink considered the arguments for and against the proposal in light of the latest available evidence and government</p> | <p>Amend Paragraph 6.57 (now para 6.30) to reference NPPF. Amend criteria (h) with the following and add an additional line at the end of the policy to reflect paragraph 27 in NPPF. (h) The proposal would have no significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of a Town Centre, including consumer choice and trade in the Town Centre.</p> <p>Where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact on one or more of the above factors, it should be refused.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre (Paragraph 24). i. For assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres, the Local Plan should ensure the requirement for an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (Paragraph 26). ii. Where an application fails the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact should it be refused (Paragraph 27). In the local context, we note that the Borough's Town Centres are under increasing pressure from out-of-centre retailing proposals. The recent officer recommendation to grant approval of the Silverlink expansion scheme (Ref: 14/01698/FUL) incorporating a 47% increase in retail provision of this already successful and popular out-of-centre shopping destination is a worrying example of the development that NewRiver Retail sees as unacceptable for an out-of-town location. Our Client is concerned that the developments such as the Silverlink have the following adverse effect on investment within the town centres: i. Drawing large numbers of people from the catchment areas. ii. Diverting significant volumes of trade from existing retailers in these centres, thereby reducing footfall in the town centres and weakening their vitality. iii. Absorbing significant volumes of expenditure growth that should be directed to existing town centres, thereby undermining the viability of town centres. iv. Removing any incentive to invest in these centres. The result of these effects incurs a significant adverse</p> | | | <p>guidance and the Councillors determined to approve the application. The Council recognises that improvements can be made in each of its centres and each has to adapt to encourage a greater number of visitors to help encourage future investment, this is reflected in the Local Plan in policy DM6.4, AS6.5, AS6.7, AS6.8 (now Policies DM3.4, AS8.13, AS8.2, AS8.3). Paragraph 6.57 (now para 6.30) and Policy DM6.10 (now Policy DM3.4) will be amended (criteria (g) and (h)) reflecting the comments suggested.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>impact on the vitality and viability of the Borough's town centres. Particularly in the context of the NewRiver Retail's asset locations, we note that North Shields and Wallsend town centres are experiencing an increasing difficulty in maintaining their due vitality. We consider that neither of these two centres is strong not enough to withstand the increasing diversion of trade to out-of-town locations, and we have set out the relevant evidence in our representations to the Silverlink proposals (Ref: 14/O1698/FUL). In brief, the commercial condition of the two town centres can be summarised as: North Shields Town Centre (in relation to the wider town centre and not The Forum Centre only) i, Has experienced a significant slippage in the retail rankings. ii, Is experiencing worsening rents and yields. iii, Is experiencing diminishing levels of operator interest and rising vacancy rates. iv, The August 2013 Experian survey recorded high vacancy rates at 15%. v, The property offer throughout the centre is out-dated and out-moded. Wallsend Town Centre (in relation to the wider town centre and not The Beacon Centre only) i, Has declined significantly in the rankings. ii, Is experiencing decline in weekly footfall. iii, Is experiencing decline in rents and yields and a rise in vacancy rates. iv, Retail units are dated and in a poor condition. v, The quality of the physical environment is poor. vi, There are key deficiencies in the comparison retail focussed on discount retail offer. Page 4 of 7 The above findings are based on the 2011 Retail Study and there has been anecdotal evidence of</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>increasing footfall and lower vacancy rates. These are however understood to be the effect of the increased market confidence following NewRiver Retail's investment in the two Centres. Overall, despite the recent signs of improvement, it is considered that North Shields and Wallsend are poorly performing centres that are under risk of diversion of trade to out-of-centre locations. It is therefore clear that that the emerging planning policy must ensure that the viability and vitality of the town centres are protected and enhanced. In light of all the above, NewRiver Retail proposes the following amendments in relation to Policy DM6.10</p> <p>Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development: i, NewRiver Retail supports the locally identified threshold of 500 sq m gross of comparison retail floorspace and considers that this would also be appropriate for convenience goods meaning that all proposed for retail developments over 500 sqm that are not located within an existing centre should provide an assessment of impact. ii, The third part of the policy states: "The proposal would be supported when the necessary Impact Assessment has shown that: g. the proposal would have no significant adverse impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on existing committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and h. the impact of the proposal on the vitality and viability of a Town Centre, including consumer choice and trade in the Town Centre." We note that in order to comply with the</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Paragraph 26 of the NPPF, point h. should read: "h. there will be no impact of the proposal on the vitality and viability of a Town Centre, including consumer choice and trade in the Town Centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made." i. We would like to request that the following assertion, in accordance with the NPPF Paragraph 27, is added to the text of the policy: "Applications that fail to satisfy the sequential test or are likely to have significant adverse impact on one or more of the above factors will be refused." Finally, our Client would like to reconfirm its position on the below suggestions put forward in the January 2014 representations: i. NewRiver Retail considers Policy DM6.10 should specifically protect from impacts on planned growth in centres from development which comes forward on edge of centre and out-of-centre sites. This would reinforce the "town centre first' approach advocated in the NPPF. The NPPF should be referenced in Paragraph 6.57 to emphasise this. i. NewRiver Retail considers it necessary to strengthen Policy DM6.10. We would like to reconfirm our position on the proposed wording for this policy. The opening Paragraphs should be amended to state "Proposals for main town centre uses on sites not within the defined town and district centres will be permitted where will not normally be permitted unless</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | they meet the following criteria" (suggested change underlined). | | | | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151756 | DM6.10 e, f, and para. 6.68 Support this approach compared to Government policy and the reasons given for it. Object to the word "unacceptable" in the last sentence of 6.68: should be "significant" to reflect the wording of DM6.10g, unacceptable is more open to interpretation and its significant impacts we want to avoid. Better still, both the policy and justification text should say "significant and/or unacceptable" to be clear. | | DM 6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development | Comment noted and paragraph 6.68 (now para 6.34) will be amended to change unacceptable to significant so therefore ensure consistency with the policy (DM6.10, now DM3.4) and national guidance (NPPF). | Amend Para 6.68 (now para 6.34) to change 'unacceptable' to ' significant ' adverse impact. |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151757 | DM6.10 b Object. Policy wording of "b" should end after the word "addressed". For North Shields at least, and I think for the other town centres, edge of centre is better than out of centre. If there were to be a big development proposed that was out of scale with a town centre I think it is better to be at the edge of centre rather than miles away out of town. Geography and site availability in practice means that there isn't space for anything massive at edges of towns anyway. The possible exception is the southern tip of Wallsend town centre but that land is "available employment land" and so presumably employment land protection policy should protect it. Even if not, wouldn't that location at the edge of Wallsend be a better and more accessible place than completely out of town? And retail or other town centre type uses like offices would be providing employment, quite likely at job densities as high as e.g. manufacturing and certainly warehousing. | | DM 6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development | Comment noted. The justification for maintaining 'edge-of-centre sites should be of a scale that is appropriate to the existing centre' is to acknowledge the differing impact of a large scale proposal against its neighbouring centre. The impact of a large scale edge of centre site against one of the Boroughs town centres (such as Wallsend) would likely have less of an impact than to a Local Centre (such as Howdon) and therefore considering the scale of a proposal in relation to the designated centre is considered appropriate. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| 806149 | New River Retail | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151881 | However, although we support the wider objectives and strategy of the Plan, we believe that it should include a specific policy mechanism for testing the effects of application proposals that come forward outside the defined North Shields regeneration areas, in order to ensure that they will not have any material adverse effects on any aspects of the regeneration strategy. Safeguarding the defined areas in this way and guiding development activity will be an important part of securing the necessary investment in the regeneration areas and we object to the Plan's lack of specific policy framework on this point, | | DM 6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development | Comment noted. Policy DM6.10 (now Policy DM3.4) does outline criteria for town centre proposals outside of a defined centre. The sequential test would need to be applied and if the proposal is for development over the local floorspace threshold it would need to provide evidence of no significant 'adverse impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal'. The intention of the Plan is put town centres first and support town centre investment opportunities. Policy DM6.10 will be amended to strengthen its approach towards town centres and refuse a proposal that fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact on criteria (g) and (h). | Amend criteria (h) with the following and add an additional line at the end of the policy to reflect paragraph 27 in NPPF. (h) The proposal would have no significant impact on the vitality and viability of a Town Centre, including consumer choice and trade in the Town Centre. Where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact on one or more of the above factors, it should be refused. |
| 878656 | | RESIDENT | LP20158 | Further housing in the Killingworth area; how can this be justified whilst the shopping facilities in the area are so poor? For example, apart from a small Greggs outlet the only food shop in the town is Morrisons. This would not be tolerated in Wallsend, North Shields or Whitley Bay, so why here? In addition to this, Killingworth has none of the following: Chinese takeaway, Indian Takeaway, Pizza Takeaway, Kebab Takeaway, Fish 'n' Chip Shop, Bank, Building Society, Butcher, Restaurant, Taxi Rank. Can you explain why it is impossible to buy a newspaper in Killingworth before 10am on a Sunday? Or why the local perception is that Morrisons own the town? Can you explain why there is no choice for the local residents? More | | S 6.2 Hierarchy of Centres | Planning cannot control the 'quality' of retailing that occupies Killingworth town centre. Morrison's supermarket does offer a large selection of products and Killingworth is not considered to be poorly served by its retail offer. Wallsend has for a long time had no supermarket in its town centre (although it has had Iceland), but recently a planning application for a new Aldi supermarket has been approved. Morrison's are significant land owners of Killingworth town centre and therefore have a significant influence in determining future investment into the town centre. There are potential benefits with the suggested increase in housing in the area as this would place a greater demand for services that could include a | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | housing will only make the absence of proper shopping facilities worse, can you explain why this has not been taken into consideration? Many people in the area are simply getting old or are disabled and unable to travel, not everyone can drive or afford to own a car. It seems as if North Tyneside Council regards the people of Killingworth as second class and not deserving of the facilities taken as granted elsewhere in the Borough. Also, since the bus services have been cut back, it is now far more difficult for people to visit shops such as Aldi in Palmersville or the Benton Asda. | | | greater variety of shops and services. Bus timetables are not a planning matter but with a potential rise in the local population it may lead to increased services with increased demand – this would be something that would need to be discussed with the bus operators. | |
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015470 | We note North Tyneside's strategic aspirations and updated assessed needs for growth in policies S5.1-5.2, S6.1-6.3 and S7.1 (now S4.1)-7.2 plus DM7.6, | | S 6.2 Hierarchy of Centres | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151253 | S6.2 Hierarchy of Centres Our Client supports proposed policy S6.2. Killingworth is listed as a main town centre, which supports its local catchment area, in line with the NPPF (22). Killingworth, unlike the other three town centres, has the capacity to expand and provide other town centre services as the town grows, this would be enhanced by an increase in population through new additional dwellings in accessible locations. Killingworth does not have a close-by out of town shopping centre to compete with, so its vitality and viability should be enhanced as a result. | | S 6.2 Hierarchy of Centres | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151488 | Support the classification of Forest Hall as a District Centre. | | S 6.2 Hierarchy of Centres | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 803900 | Northumberland | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151530 | The Council supports the town centre first approach and the proposed hierarchy of | | S 6.2 Hierarchy of | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| | County Council | | | centres, as this relates to our own hierarchy. The Council supports the continued definition of the Silverlink as an "out of centre" shopping area in paragraph 6.15. | | Centres | | |
| 899323 | | | LP20151603 | NewRiver Retail supports the continued designation of the existing Town Centres as proposed under this Policy and the emphasis placed on the role of North Shields and Wallsend as the main retail destinations within the Borough. Paragraph 6.15 provides supportive text to this policy and notes that the Silverlink Retail Park is not currently designated as a centre within the retail hierarchy. NewRiver Retail also supports the continued non-designation of Silverlink Retail Park, as stipulated in Paragraph 6.15. Silverlink is an out-of-centre Retail Park and should continue to be considered and designated as such in order to prevent the increase in town centre uses that would have a harmful effect on the established Wallsend and North Shields town centres. | | S 6.2 Hierarchy of Centres | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151811 | The Northumberland Estates support the Local Plan's emphasis on vibrant town centres. The Local Plan identifies a hierarchy of centres (Policy S6.2) in North Tyneside, including town centres, district centres, and local centres. Northumberland Estates support the inclusion of Northumberland Park within the second tier of this hierarchy as a designated district centre. Paragraph 6.13 outlines that Northumberland Park's status as a district centre depends on its expansion as identified on the Policies Map Site 30. Northumberland Estates supports the expansion of Northumberland Park within the | | S 6.2 Hierarchy of Centres | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| | | | | <p>plan period, and supports the Local Plan's identification of the area as a district centre based on its future development. Site 30 is identified on the Policies Map as Land at Backworth Metro, Northumberland Park, and is allocated as a preferred retail development site. The Northumberland Estates supports the identification of this site for retail use, and consider that priority should be given to a range of retail and town centre uses on the site. This site is approximately 3.9 hectares, and consists largely of undeveloped land. The site benefits from a very sustainable location, in close proximity to the adjacent Northumberland Park District Centre, and excellent public transport accessibility through the Northumberland Park Metro Station and Park & Ride facility. The site is in close proximity to two identified "Large Sites with Planning Permission" "Scaffold Hill and Backworth Park. Both of these sites have planning permission for housing, and therefore Site 30 will fulfil an increasingly important role in contributing to Northumberland Park District Centre as a sustainable centre serving a major growth point and growing local population.</p> | | | | |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151921 | <p>The Northumberland Estates support the definition of Northumberland Park as a District Centre. This reflects the centre's current and future role in serving the existing and proposed residential and business communities in the surrounding area. The Northumberland Estates also support the recognition at Para. 6.13 of the Consultation 2015 that Northumberland Park District</p> | | S 6.2 Hierarchy of Centres | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | Centre has the potential for future expansion, in order to help meet the Borough's overall need for retail provision. The Northumberland Estates are concerned, however that its identification as a District Centre is dependent on the delivery of the edge of centre site allocated in the Local Plan and that if this site is not delivered then Northumberland Park would be classed as a Local Centre. The Northumberland Estates is committed to submitting an outline application for the development of this site for retail use in the near future, securing its status as a District Centre. | | | | |
| 901136 | | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20152066 | Newcastle acknowledge that North Tyneside's consultation recognises the significant role and function of Newcastle city centre as the regional centre and a key transport hub which is easily accessible to residents from all parts of North Tyneside. Consequently there is leakage of comparison goods retail spend from North Tyneside to Newcastle and we welcome the support for the allocation of East Pilgrim Street Key Site in the CSUCP. Newcastle support North Tyneside's approach to the retail hierarchy and the role and function of centres within North Tyneside. North Tyneside's Retail and Leisure Study (2014) recommends modest future retail growth over the next 5 years increasing towards the end of the plan period as growth in population and per capita spend increases. We support North Tyneside's approach to identifying centres which could accommodate future growth in accordance with the NPPF and the potential to identify additional | | S 6.2 Hierarchy of Centres | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | centres as part of the strategic housing release. | | | | |
| 878767 | | | LP201520 | The projected additional required floor space for town centre retail units appears to be substantially over optimistic. At December 2014, it is quoted that the current shop unit vacancy in Whitley Bay was at 10%, North Shields at 15% and Wallsend at 16%. Indeed the Council already recognises that there is a need to convert a proportion of our existing and future vacant shops and the spaces above into residential units so that our town centres can become more economically viable, vibrant and sustainable. (See Policy DM6.4). If the projected required floor space for retail units does not materialise, this will provide additional sites for further residential use and could help reduce the need for developing some of the planned proposed greenfield housing estates. | | S 6.3 Future Retail Demand | Comment Noted. Retail needs for North Tyneside are based on expert advice from consultants who have considered the growth projections for the Local Plan. The assessment also takes into consideration, the quality and attractiveness of the current retail offer, and existing levels of vacancy, and is informed by an approach that would increase the proportion of retail expenditure arising from residents of North Tyneside that is spent within the Borough. The policies in the Local Plan will need be monitored on an annual basis and will be reviewed if specific requirements for development are not being achieved. | Specific sites have been defined on the policies map. |
| 890851 | | RESIDENT | LP2015167 | We also need local shops | | S 6.3 Future Retail Demand | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to support sustainable development in the Borough and the Plan supports the provision of small scale local facilities, helping to support local communities. The Plan also seeks to revitalise its town centres supporting vibrant centres that improve the range and quality of shops, services and facilities. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015471 | We note North Tyneside's strategic aspirations and updated assessed needs for growth in policies S5.1-5.2, S6.1-6.3 and S7.1 (now S4.1)-7.2 plus DM7.6, including: i, -i, to provide for at least (a revised up) 6,378m2 of additional net convenience retail floorspace and (a revised down) 15,249m2 of additional | | S 6.3 Future Retail Demand | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | comparison goods floorspace between 2014-2032; | | | | |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151922 | <p>The Northumberland Estates support the amendment to Policy S6.3 to refer to the provision of "at least" the amount of additional retail floorspace set out in the policy. This goes towards addressing its objection to the 2013 Consultation which sought to impose limits on the quantum of convenience and comparison floorspace which can come forward in the Borough. Whilst the updated Study provides a helpful starting point in assessing the availability of expenditure capacity to support new development, individual proposals which emerge throughout the plan period will be subject to retail impact assessment at the point of planning application submission, and this may identify the potential for significant additional floorspace over and above that currently identified. It is noted that paragraph 6.16 of the Consultation 2015 states that, the updated Retail Study identifies no overarching need for major leisure developments during the plan period. This is surprising given that per capita spending on leisure activities is forecast to grow significantly over the next ten years, by around 14% (on the basis of forecasts provided by Experian). In the context of the need to plan for all development needs in full, as set out in the NPPF, it is important that the Council plans positively to provide new leisure facilities which meet the needs generated by this growth in spending. This is particularly the case given the new and emerging leisure</p> | | S 6.3 Future Retail Demand | <p>Comment noted. Successful town centres can no longer rely on retail to be the only function in a town centre. Increasingly the role of leisure uses is an important component of a successful centre as visitor's aspirations for greater availability and choice rises. The recent retail and Leisure Study (2014) concluded that there was no qualitative requirement for further major leisure developments of a bingo or a cinema but there is scope for the development of restaurants, pubs and bars across the Boroughs centres to improve the evening economy – especially in Wallsend. The 2011 Study concluded that the process to determine a future quantitative need for additional food and drink outlets and other commercial leisure uses is difficult to predict so rather than taking an approach of defining an overall level of future need, the Local Plan seeks to support the development of leisure developments in the most appropriate sustainable locations meeting the necessary local and national policy requirements.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | schemes coming forward in nearby local authority areas, including those in Newcastle City Centre, Gateshead Town Centre and Cramlington, and at Metro Centre- which are likely to attract customers from North Tyneside and contribute towards unsustainable travel patterns. Paragraph 6.25 notes that there is significant scope for the development of a further mix of restaurants, pubs and bars across the borough up to 2032. In this regard it is considered that the site to the south-west of Northumberland Park, identified to accommodate the expansion of Northumberland Park District Centre, offers potential, in both planning and commercial terms, to accommodate such uses, potentially alongside any new retail uses. This would also result in benefits, in terms of linked trips and spin-off business, for existing uses within the centre. | | | | |
| 878767 | | | LP201521 | The Policy to encourage the conversion of some of the existing and future vacant shop units and the space above to residential units is welcomed. However the resulting increase in housing units created by this conversion does not appear to have been taken into account when projecting the number of net new housing units that will be required across the region. Similarly the conversion of hotel/guest house (and other existing buildings) to residential units will also reduce the need for new housing. The conversions need to be taken into consideration when forecasting the future need for new housing. Such conversions may help defer or even avoid the need for developing out of town | | DM 6.4 Primary Shopping Areas | The Local Plan does consider the amount of residential development that could be provided through the conversion of shop units and developing residential units above shops. However, the levels of residential development provided in town centres would not be of the scale to defer or avoid the need to develop out of town Greenfield sites for housing. The amount of homes required to provide for the growth of development needed in North Tyneside from 2011/12 to 2031/32 is 16,632. Of these, some sites have been granted planning permission (approx. 5,000 homes), some have been built between 2011/12 and December 2014 (approx 1,600) and some | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | greenfield sites for housing. It is suggested that you may therefore feel it appropriate to adjust your forecasted housing needs to reflect and encourage these potential property conversions into your figures. | | | have been identified as suggested sites in the current consultation (approx. 8,800 homes). The remaining provision of homes not accounted for (approx 1,200 homes) are expected to come forward for development over the period of the Local Plan in sites that are not considered to be strategic but contribute to the overall supply, such as residential development in town centres. | |
| 797386 | | | LP20151056 | Your map of North Shields does not note the preponderance of businesses in offices in the Square and surrounding streets. It is vital that any residential development does not result in those businesses concluding that they no longer want to be based in that area. | | DM 6.4 Primary Shopping Areas | Comment noted. The offices surrounding Northumberland Square perform an important role in bringing economic development to the town centre. The Plan has no intention to undermine the offices that currently operate around the Square and if more offices were to occupy the area in the square this would be welcomed but residential development would also be seen as acceptable and therefore the small brownfield site at Albion road has been suggested. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151341 | | | DM 6.4 Primary Shopping Areas | Comment is blank and also blank within online database - conclude that comment record created in error. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899323 | | | LP20151610 | As per our previous representations, NewRiver Retail supports the designation of the Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages orientated at promoting vitality and viability of the centre in its principal role as an area of retail activity. We agree with designating the Beacon Shopping Centre and the Forum Shopping Centre frontages as Primary Shopping Frontage, as proposed in Maps 7 and 8 of the Consultation Document. We note that the Policy seeks to prevent | | DM 6.4 Primary Shopping Areas | Comments noted. The designation of a percentage of A1 frontage within Policy DM6.4 (now Policy DM3.4) will be considered as the Plan is prepared to ensure the purpose of the Policy will deliver its objective to revitalise the Boroughs town centres. The work of the Town Centre manager and the Geographic Information Systems team and analysis from other authorities can be shared to help explain the reasoning of the percentage based policy if | Policy amended to 80% and now covers A1, A2 and A3 use class to allow for the greater mix of town centres uses that add to the vitality of a town centre, whilst also trying to offer some thresholds to encourage a healthy town centre |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>development in primary Shopping Frontage which would result in less than 70%. Whilst the additional considerations are welcome, NewRiver Retail considers a requirement for 70% of the frontage in Class A1 use to be too commercially restrictive and we are not aware of evidence that would back up the proposed policy. We note that, in the Consultation Response to our comments from January 2014, the Council refers to evidence drawn from the "work of the Town Centre Manager and Geographic Information Team and analysis from other authorities". We would like to kindly request that this information is made available to justify the proposed threshold. NewRiver Retail considers it necessary for Policy DM6.4 to be further amended to be more commercially flexible, or at least appropriately cross referenced to other relevant policies. The North Tyneside Retail and Leisure Study (December 2011) reports Wallsend noticeably underperforms in both "restaurant and cafes, and bars, clubs and pubs categories" which "highlights the extremely limited provision of such facilities in the town centre" (Paragraph 5.106). Whilst NewRiver Retail recognises the importance of maintaining the primary retail function of town centre, the policy should be amended to recognise that leisure pursuits such as eating out as part of a wider shopping trip are now far more common and contribute to the vitality and viability of the town centre. Paragraph 1.37 of the Retail Study indicates leisure services expenditure is expected to grow up to 148.8m by 2027, of which 63% will</p> | | | <p>it remains within the policy. The Council recognises the increasing role of leisure pursuits to the success of a town centre as the traditional high street is changing. Improving the quality and offer of restaurants, cafes, pubs/bars in the Boroughs town centres could increase in footfall and longer dwell time in a centre and also encourage people to visit outside the normal 9am-5pm opening hours for most shops.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | be eating and drinking establishments (Paragraph 8.39). It is recommended that capturing a sizeable proportion of this growth expenditure will be vital for the health of North Tyneside centres "In particular the provision of a wider and more appealing choice of restaurants, cafés and pubs/bars in Wallsend would support the growth of an evening economy in the centre, and it would enhance access to such facilities for the town's residents" (Paragraph 1.38). In order for Wallsend to benefit from this expenditure, Policy DM6.4 should be amended to allow a higher percentage of non-retail uses in the Primary Shopping Frontage based upon clear evidence. Alternatively, policies such as AS6.5 (North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre) and AS6.7 (The Forum Shopping Centre, Wallsend) should clearly take precedence over more "generic' defined retail frontage policy. | | | | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151749 | North Shields Town Centre boundary on inset proposals map Object. Town Centre boundary should include Site 64 (which should not be a housing site-see below). This site is in 'proper'/main town centre uses and should remain so, even if some of the uses on it change somewhat. It is close to the actual centre and to the Metro Station, e.g. compared with areas such as Norfolk Street and Stephenson Street. | DM 6.4 Primary Shopping Areas | | Comment noted. The proximity of Site 64 to the town centre and sustainable transport links mean that it could support a variety of different uses. The Local Plan suggests that the site is suitable for a mix of residential and employment uses. These are both seen as supporting the town centre and therefore although not within the town centre boundary, they would be supported through the Local Plan. The reason for not extending the town centre boundary is because the Local Plan is trying to strengthen the retail heart of its town centres and creating a more vibrant town rather than dispersing its town centre offer. This followed the | Policy amended to 80% and now covers A1, A2 and A3 use class to allow for the greater mix of town centres uses that add to the vitality of a town centre, whilst also trying to offer some thresholds to encourage a healthy town centre |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | recommendations of the Retail and Leisure Study 2011 and the recent update (2014). | |
| 899323 | | | LP20151611 | We welcome the Council's support for revitalisation proposals for the Beacon Shopping Centre and the Forum Shopping Centre. We note that these policies are in compliance with Paragraph 23 of the NPPF which states that where town centres are in decline, local planning authorities should plan positively for their future to encourage economic activity. NewRiver Retail recognises the need for improvements in the quality of the retail environment of its assets and is considering investment and regeneration opportunities within the two Shopping Centres. Our Client will support a new Local Plan that ensures a supportive and flexible policy framework for promoting investment in the Beacon and the Forum. In relation to the expansion potential of North Shields and Wallsend, we note the amendment to Paragraph 6.12 (previously 6.17) and recommend further changes to this narrative. NewRiver Retail consider that greater recognition should be paid to the capacity of North Shields and Wallsend to absorb further town centre development and address the identified need for new retail floorspace in order to prevent inappropriate out-of-centre development. | | AS 6.5 North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre | Comment noted. The Council supports a town centres first approach to appropriate investment into its town centres. We welcome the opportunity to work with the respondent to identify where the future retail needs can be accommodated in the town centres. | Contacted the agents to request any potential amendments to the policy that could further strengthen the town centres or if they are aware of any future regeneration proposals for the town centres. Amend wording in first line of paragraph 6.57 (now para 6.30) to add the words 'with national guidance.' which was missing from the previous version. |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151760 | Para. 6.35 (and Plan policy AS6.5 wording consequences that need changing) Object. This approach is wrong, and can lead to bad outcomes. Housing is a component of healthy and vital town centres, yes. It was some of the post-war new towns which suffered from | | AS 6.5 North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre | Comment noted. Town centre businesses should be the principle occupants of town centres but the increasingly diverse nature of towns means that housing can contribute towards the future of a centre. Striking the balance between town centre uses and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | having town centres devoid of housing. But the primary uses in centres should be retail, offices business etc and leisure. With SOME housing, that is ancillary to those primary uses. There have been two recently completed small housing developments on Wellington Street West, after the sites have lain vacant for decades, that may it seems have potentially stymied one of the major redevelopment opportunities in North Shields. The wording of 6.35 is an open invitation for housing developers to put housing anywhere and everywhere they wish in a centre. Its just the argument they are looking for and its nearly always easy to make money out of housing. So para 6.35 and any tied Policy wording doesn't fit with the Plan's employment aspirations. And a sustainable place to provide employment is in town centres, especially as they are more likely to be close to the homes of poor people seeking employment. Also the nature of such employment provided in town centres might be more suitable to the unemployed most seeking it -from unemployed to shop or leisure assistant is probably an easier step than e.g. from the dole to skilled manufacturing. Its one of the ways regeneration needs to be integrated. | | | residential is crucial so that town centre uses remain the primary component to a centre. The Plan supports a greater range of uses in town centres such as offices, leisure and entertainment facilities that not only offer employment opportunities, but also add a greater vibrancy and vitality to a centre. | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151761 | North Shields town centre generally (plans, policies, text) Object Para. 6.37 What "Plan for North Shields"? I can't see anything more than a town centre boundary with primary and secondary shopping frontages and the location of The Beacon Centre marked on it. Perhaps the authority being forced to change | | AS 6.5 North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre | Comment noted. The Policy concentrates on the sub area of the town centre – the Beacon Centre. The Plan for North Shields is reflected in the Local Plan by a combination of policies that are dispersed throughout the document, rather than being grouped together in an Area Action Plan. The | Wording in paragraph 6.37 amended to 'Area Specific policies for North Shields have been based' (now para 11.54) |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | to a single Local Plan and abandon the Core Strategy with Area Action Plans approach has meant that the spatial area planning that the LDF system was invented, under the Labour Government, to facilitate (with an aim of tackling problems/issues of old urban areas and regeneration, not just new green field development) seems completely missing. I guess that staff resources are in short supply, but it seems unfortunately that there needs to be more imagination/spatial planning for the future in the Local Plan. Although there have been a number of studies done; relevant, practical and useful stuff should actually be in the Local Plan, not hidden away in a background study. (Some old studies are apparently of variable degrees of practical use e.g. a park and ride proposal near North Shields Metro Station that doesn't seem to recognise the vast difference in ground levels across the site). | | | wording of this paragraph will be amended for clarity. The Policy aims to shape future plans for the Beacon Centre through criteria that reflect earlier consultation responses and evidence from previous studies. Policies for North Shields identify regeneration sites in the town centre, improvements to the public realm, guidance for heritage assets and improved connections with the Fish Quay and Smiths Dock. The intention of Policy DM6.4 (now Policy DM3.4) is to encourage a concentrated retail heart to the town centre whilst allowing a more diverse mix of uses in the secondary shopping areas | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151765 | North Shields shouldn't just be left to go into further decline: heading more in the direction of a town of 'cheap end' shops with a few low value specialist shops. It needs revitalising as well as regenerating. Its not as if there is no demand for retail and leisure space. The plan in policy 6.10c says that retail developers should be flexible about business models and retail format, but if there aren't the sites available in Shields they are just going to develop their usual preferred formats. The Asda (ex Netto) store in North Shields is an example of how a modern town centre use can be developed to a high design standard in a town centre location, accessible by car and | | AS 6.5 North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre | Comment noted. The Council is committed to supporting improvements to its town centres and maximising the opportunities to revitalise the town centres. The Local Plan seeks to encourage appropriate investment and development into the town centres through planning policies, but this investment often is dependent on securing funding and the availability of sites. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | on foot. Shields needs more of this approach (even if that location isn't perfect its pretty good given the constraints in an old town). Also, the Park View Shopping Centre was developed in Whitley Bay, another example of the sort of thing that would massively change the fortunes of North Shields and provide an antidote and alternative to out of town shopping. For economic development we might well need a combination of new edge or out of centre development, but also in-town development and regeneration. But we need to exploit all possible opportunities for the latter. | | | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152158 | Policy AS6.5 - I would suggest the following: 'The Council will support'. '(c) Enhancing the building's appearance ... '. | | AS 6.5 North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre | Comments noted. | Amendments made as suggested. |
| 895180 | | RESIDENT | LP2015516 | South Parade should be regenerated to remove the drinking culture. | | AS 6.6 Coastal Evening Economy: Whitley Bay and Tynemouth | Comment noted. The Council are working to regenerate South Parade and change the perception of the area and this is supported in Policy AS6.6 (now Policy AS8.20). | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152159 | Policy AS6.6 - I would suggest the following: '(a) Support a sustainable evening economy without undermining the ability of the CIP to ... '. | | AS 6.6 Coastal Evening Economy: Whitley Bay and Tynemouth | Comments noted. | Amendments made as suggested. |
| 396449 | Cyclists Touring Club | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015582 | e. As well as accessible parking provision, secure and undercover cycle parking also needs to be provided. If there is a suitably located multi-storey car park this is often a good location for such. This comment relates to all retail areas, not just The Forum | | AS 6.7 The Forum Shopping Centre, Wallsend | Agreed. The wording of criteria e. relates to parking provision by shoppers and does not identify parking just for motor vehicles but the policy could also be applied to cyclists. Policy DM10.4 (now Policy DM7.4) would also apply to any potential cycle parking in | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | Shopping Centre. | | | town centres and criteria (c) references the Transport and Highways SPD, which recommends that for retail development cycle parking should be covered. | |
| 899323 | | | LP20151612 | We welcome the Council's support for revitalisation proposals for the Beacon Shopping Centre and the Forum Shopping Centre. We note that these policies are in compliance with Paragraph 23 of the NPPF which states that where town centres are in decline, local planning authorities should plan positively for their future to encourage economic activity. NewRiver Retail recognises the need for improvements in the quality of the retail environment of its assets and is considering investment and regeneration opportunities within the two Shopping Centres. Our Client will support a new Local Plan that ensures a supportive and flexible policy framework for promoting investment in the Beacon and the Forum. In relation to the expansion potential of North Shields and Wallsend, we note the amendment to Paragraph 6.12 (previously 6.17) and recommend further changes to this narrative. NewRiver Retail consider that greater recognition should be paid to the capacity of North Shields and Wallsend to absorb further town centre development and address the identified need for new retail floorspace in order to prevent inappropriate out-of-centre development. | | AS 6.7 The Forum Shopping Centre, Wallsend | Comment noted. The Council supports a town centres first approach to appropriate investment into its town centres. We welcome the opportunity to work with the respondent to identify where the future retail needs can be accommodated in the town centres. | Contacted the agents to request any potential amendments to the policy that could further strengthen the town centres or if they are aware of any future regeneration proposals for the town centres. Amend wording in first line of paragraph 6.57 (now para 6.30) to add the words 'with national guidance.' which was missing from the previous version. |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151812 | Policy AS6.9 relates specifically to Northumberland Park's development as a district centre. Northumberland Estates support the Local Plan in having a policy | | AS 6.9 Northumberland Park District Centre | Comment noted. The Local Plan reflects NPPF to 'allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail.....It is important that needs for retail are not | Policy merged into S6.3 (now S3.3) and additional wording relating the comparison needs of the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | specific to this development. The policy states that predominantly comparison retail use will be supported, however it is considered that whilst this is important, the policy should also support convenience retail use in Northumberland Park. As Policy S6.3 demonstrates, there is a significant demand for convenience retail floorspace across North Tyneside between 2014-2032 alongside comparison retail floorspace. It is considered that this should be encouraged across all of the borough's town and district centres, including Northumberland Park. It is also considered that not only should comparison and convenience retail floorspace be promoted in Northumberland Park, but there should also be a more flexible approach to providing a wide range of 'town centre uses', such as restaurants, cafes, and bars. This would further promote Northumberland Park as a district centre in its own right, and also foster a greater community identity and sense of place. | | Retail Development | compromised by limited site availability.'(Para 23). In response to the evidence in the Retail and Leisure Study 2014 there is a recognised need for comparison floorspace that typically requires a larger floorspace and due to predominance of small units within the boroughs town centres the Northumberland Park site offers the opportunity to meet the type of retail need identified. Policy AS6.9 has been merged into Policy S6.3 (which is now Policy 3.3) and allows for some flexibility in the type of retail on the type of use for the site. | borough added to the Policy to allow for changing retail needs through the Plan period. |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151923 | The Northumberland Estates is strongly supportive of the Council's aspirations to expand Northumberland Park District Centre to include land south-west of Northumberland Park Metro Station. Para. 6.55 of the Consultation 2015 indicates that the Centre has the capacity for expansion, with a revised boundary increasing the overall area of the District Centre by approximately 4 ha, potentially capable of supporting 10,000sqm to 15,000 sqm of retail floorspace. Such growth can clearly not be accommodated within the existing District | | AS 6.9 Northumberland Park District Centre Retail Development | Comment noted and support for the policy is welcomed. The suggested amendments to the criteria to allow any town centre use on the site fails to recognise the requirement on the Local Authority to determine the future retail needs for the Borough and once determined provide details of where the type of retail development could be allocated (NPPF Para 156, 157 and 161). The Local Plan is therefore seeking to provide clarity as to where retail needs will be allocated and the type of retail required, promoting a diverse retail offer (NPPF Para | Incorporation of Policy AS6.9 into Policy S6.3 (now Policy S3.3) with a more comprehensive list of sites that can accommodate the retail needs identified. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Centre boundary. The Consultation 's approach is therefore considered to be in line with the NPPF, which states at Para. 23 that, in drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should:" ... allocate appropriate edge of centre sites for main town centre uses that are well connected to the town centre where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available."The site to the south-west of Northumberland Park Metro Station is currently allocated for, inter alia, leisure development within the adopted UDP. However it is noted that criterion a) of Policy AS6.9 currently states that new development within the Centre will be permitted provided that it comprises "Predominantly comparison retail use based on net floorspace of the overall uses proposed in the extension". This wording would appear to be overly restrictive and contrary to Para. 23 of the NPPF, which states that, in drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should:" ... promote competitive town centres that provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer</p> <p>"In the current economic climate, it is essential that the proposals set out in the Local Plan are sufficiently flexible to ensure the commercial viability and deliverability of development schemes. Moreover Para. 157 of the NPPF states:"Crucially, Local Plans should ... allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land ... "The site should therefore be allocated in accordance with the NPPF to allow a full range of appropriate town centre uses. In this context it should be noted that the development of a pub/restaurant has</p> | | | <p>23). The Retail and Leisure Study has determined the floorspace requirements for the Borough as 15,249sqm comparison floorspace and 6,378sqm convenience floorspace. The policy does not seek to be overly restrictive, allowing for a variety of town centres uses, but it does seek to provide clarity by identifying where future floorspace could be accommodated and by the fact there is twice the amount of comparison floorspace required this is reflected in the policy.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>already been brought forward on the site. Taken together, and in order to ensure that Northumberland Park District Centre is well-placed to meet the future needs of the expanding residential and business communities in the local area, it is recommended that Policy AS 6.9 be amended to identify the potential for a full range of town centre uses on the site, as well as both convenience and comparison floorspace. The Northumberland Estates consider that, subject to the amendments set out below, Policy AS6.9 would represent a suitably flexible and aspirational policy to ensure the delivery of the extension to Northumberland Park District Centre:"Proposals for new development(s) within the boundary of the Northumberland Park District Centre as identified on the Policies Map will be permitted provided that they meet all of the following criteria: a. It can contribute to meeting the convenience and comparison retail, and other main town centre use, needs of the surrounding community; b. The development of the extension to the District Centre on land to the south-west is fully integrated with the existing centre, surrounding neighbourhoods and Northumberland Park metro station, with particular attention paid to addressing pedestrian and cycle links; and c. The scale of any new f/floorspace reflects its position as a district centre."</p> | | | | |
| 630751 | | | LP201527 | <p>Could someone tell me please the point of asking North Tyneside residents for their opinions and wishes, if having done so to,</p> | | Housing 7 | <p>Comments noted. Planning consent for development at Station Road, which was not designated Green Belt, was refused by</p> | <p>No amendments proposed.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | then agree to allow a corrupt bunch of councillors to change the decision of the people like the East Benton / Hadrian lodge green belt build. Makes a mockery of democratic wishes of the people ,not to mention waste of rate payers Money [NTC comment for clarity: planning consent for development at Station Road was refused by Councillors at North Tyneside Planning Committee but was overturned by an independent national Planning Inspector.] | | | Councillors at North Tyneside Planning Committee but was overturned by an independent national Planning Inspector. | |
| 792502 | | RESIDENT | LP201526 | thank you for your e mail re planning on North Tyneside, but there is obviously no point in commenting on anything as the council will do what it wants to do. Despite large scale objections to building on the land to the north of Station Road Wallsend building is due to commence in the near future ruining an area of natural beauty and with wild life habitat destroyed. [NTC comment for clarity: planning consent for development at Station Road was refused by Councillors at North Tyneside Planning Committee but was overturned by an independent national Planning Inspector.] There is an abundance of waste land around North Tyneside that could be built on but it lies derelict and wasted as it has done for years and the council would rather ruin something nice. There are people in Wallsend who, those fields are the only opportunity to see things growing to see how produce is grown to see what farmers do. So no I will not be taking part in any discussion thank you, I am sure the council will continue to ruin Wallsend leaving the town derelict and | | Housing 7 | Comments noted. The Local Plan encourages the use of brownfield land and contains many potential developments sites on brownfield land. However evidence on population growth and housing needs means that we also need to look towards sustainable green field sites. Planning consent for development at Station Road was refused by Councillors at North Tyneside Planning Committee but was overturned by an independent national Planning Inspector. The Council are currently pursuing a regeneration scheme in Wallsend that is supported by policies in this Local Plan. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | pouring all of the funds into Tynemouth and Whitley Bay | | | | |
| 792504 | | | LP2015155 | We have new housing already approved at Holystone next to the Swallow Pond Nature Reserve, new houses next to the Palmersville Metro and behind Forest Gate and additional various infill developments in Benton all adding to the congestion. To add to that we have a huge approved development East Benton Rise - off Station Road [the A186] with a further proposal for even more houses on green fields opposite [17] and at Darsely Park [111]. This will merge Benton, Palmersville, Wallsend, Forest Hall, Holystone, Backworth with little or no open spaces between. The green wildlife corridors proposed by the council are simply not enough. | | Housing 7 | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898969 | | | LP2015998 | It is disappointing to see yet more greenbelt/ undeveloped land being earmarked for housing, in particular the areas around Murton and Killingworth Moor, which, should they be developed, will become nothing more than just suburbs rather than unique rural, communities. The council should rethink its plans for housing to identify sites that have been used previously as well as considering the type of houses that are constructed. In addition, the council must ensure that any new homes are sustainable and adopt a range of features including grey water recycling, renewable energy, minimising the extent of surface area lost to development, sustainable drainage systems and housing/ habitats for wildlife. | | Housing 7 | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 797386 | | | LP20151057 | As has been said many times both in respect of the earlier Plan and this one, there is no | | Housing 7 | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | need for the large amount of housing planned. And what is needed can be accommodated on brownfield sites and other areas that do not interfere with green areas. | | | assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | |
| 899278 | | | LP20151110 | When the new houses are built, consideration must be given to the fact that the houses will form a community and "design in" opportunities for members of the community to get to know each other and especially for children to make friends in their community. Spaces between the houses are very important for informal play. Young children need to play close to their home where they can be supervised. Doorstep play areas need to be built into the design of new estates. Doorstep play could involve small pieces of play equipment, but a space with suitable surface for bikes, scooters and "small world play" or where a play tent can be pitched can be equally valuable. Interesting and attractive landscaping such as low walls, granite boulders, grasses, daisies, pebbles and trees (for sticks) can all provide play opportunities for young children. Seating and bins are also important to support children's play and encourage social interaction. In bigger housing development, the house builders should support the development of supervised play provision such as the very successful Shiremoor Adventure Playground. Investment in skilled, qualified play workers can prevent unnecessary expenditure on anti- | | Housing 7 | Comments are noted. The local plan sets out a range of policy for design, provision of green space and new play areas in accordance with local evidence. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | social behaviour and reduce the number of occasions when bored children will seek less appropriate play opportunities. New housing also needs to be criss crossed with a network of footpaths and scooter/cycle ways to encourage children to cycle or walk to school and in so doing be more active and healthy. | | | | |
| 805471 | | | LP20151136 | I am dismayed by the proposed planning of 3500 house in such a small geographic area (little Benton farm, Whitley Road area) There have been significant developments already in this area and interestingly properties are still available for sale/rent. I agree that housing needs to be provided however why saturate one area to the detriment of the green environment, transport infrastructure and existing residents. I for one will consider moving from the area should this development go ahead. The majority of these developments are aimed at professionals in employment who can pick and choose where they reside. Do you really think they will choose to live in an area where there is limited green space and the traffic is horrific in a large saturated property development. I absolutely agree that affordable social housing and properties with one bedroom and for the retired should be a priority however ultimately property developers rely on the private sales for their profit margins to enable them to also offer social housing within their developments. Putting 3500 houses in the area could mean an increase in population of 10000 and another 5000 (est) cars on the road in that area alone. Which is an horrific contemplation when the existing | | Housing 7 | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | infrastructures are struggling and the plans suggested to assist this are grossly inadequate. Please reconsider and look at building smaller developments throughout the area which will provide choice and also share the associated infrastructure and built environment issues rather than burdening this small particular area with one third of the Local Plan Housing generation. Losing the green environment will attract less people without the damage to the wildlife etc. | | | | |
| 805554 | | | LP20151213 | Population growth estimates are unrealistic and need to be revisited. Building on green spaces that will lead to loss of identity for communities (i.e. Wallsend, Benton, Holystone) should further development take place at North West side of station road is unacceptable. Further work to regenerate existing housing in the borough and identification of brownfield sites should be to priority. | | Housing 7 | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 592280 | | | LP20151312 | The plan appears to go against the Lower Growth Option accepted at the earlier consultation. The high growth forecasts have resulted in swathes of green space (agricultural and wildlife corridor) being allocated to housing. It is worrying that the clear distinction between Wallsend and Benton will disappear if the proposed sites south and north of the A191 are built on reducing drastically amenity, green space and environmental diversity in general and isolating the Rising Sun Country park and other wildlife/recreational sites that we should be proud of and enhance if possible. High housing growth compromises efforts to | | Housing 7 | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | mitigate climate change by spreading people around and increasing traffic (unless rigorous measures are taken for sustainable low carbon transport options.) | | | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151343 | General comment: There is a tendency among the local Plans we have scrutinised in the North-East for Local Planning Authorities overstate their likely population growth and therefore their housing need. Part of this stems, we believe, from looking at population trends and migration patterns on an authority-wide rather than subregional scale, part from ambitious but unrealistic economic growth and job creations, part from flawed modelling linking economic growth aspirations and housing requirement, and part in not taking into account the strategic policy interventions of neighbouring councils. Our current calculations suggest that aggregate levels of proposed housing provision in emerging Plans across the NECA area would accommodate in-migration of some 164,000 into the subregion over the next fifteen years. So far as we are aware, this level of in-migration has not been attained within the past fifty years and more. | | Housing 7 | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890396 | | RESIDENT | LP2015129 | I think that there are too many new houses proposed in the Council's plan especially around Palmersville. Great Lime Road is very busy already and would struggle to cope with much more traffic. | | New Housing | Comments noted. There are a number of planned transport works planned within the borough to help the congestion problems North Tyneside currently faces. In addition to this traffic issues will be assessed through the planning application process. | No amendments proposed. |
| 804904 | | | LP2015256 | In relation to the below sections.(7.15 etc) it seems that all three models - regardless of which model the council decides to eventually sell as the justification to the masses that | | New Housing | Comments noted. The Local Plan has to plan for the Borough's objectively assessed housing needs. The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan that has | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | building extra homes is the answer to all problems - suggest a more significant growth in both the child and elderly category, however all this section refers to is the introduction of more homes [on green field land!] yet not the amount of schools, old peoples homes required to cater for the impending boom in north Tyneside population growth during the coming [dark] years within North Tyneside! please elaborate on the councils decision to tackle this problem? | | | assessed the infrastructure requirements of the future population of North Tyneside and how this can be delivered alongside development. | |
| 804850 | | | LP2015755 | Any new housing must be mostly affordable or social. Estate agents around Whitley Bay are full of houses for sale, well out of the price range of the vast majority of people. We don't need any more homes like the one's at West Park the market is flooded with these types of property. Housing developers must not be allowed to cherry pick post codes to maximise profit. If housing is to be considered, the visual impact of this should be taken into consideration with regard to existing residents e.g. tree lining new developments. Suitable road infrastructure must be included as roads are already overburdened and cause misery for existing residents, in particular around the Monkseaton area. | | New Housing | Comments noted. Policy on 'Affordable Housing' states that 25% of all new homes are to be affordable within new developments of 10 or more dwellings, or on sites of 0.5 ha or more. The mix of housing tenures and types have been informed through evidence such as the SHMA. Transport and visual impacts will be assessed through the planning application process. | No amendments proposed. |
| 804850 | | | LP2015757 | There are an abundance of unused shops and flats above them in all of our town centres. These could be easily converted and modernised to provide low cost or social housing. | | New Housing | As stated within the Local Plan: The Government has implemented a significant number of changes to liberalise permitted development rights as part of a package of measures aimed at boosting development and growth in the economy. These have included a number of measures aimed | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | specifically at town centres including allowing the conversion of office-to-residential (with exemptions) and allowing the change of use from retail to cafés and restaurants below 200sqm (gross) and subject to prior approval without the need for planning permission. | |
| 804904 | | | LP2015908 | My mathematics is not the best, but points 7.31 and 7.32 seem to assume that over an 8 year period the number of 'people' moving to the area increased by 8000. Assuming we do not employ the strategies to reduce this mentioned in 7.32, then within the 21 year period between 2011 and 2032 this number will increase by 21000 . If we take the number of homes being planned between that period (16000) and divide it by the number of people emigrating do we not arrive at the figure of 1.131. This figure (in my simplistic logic means) that we either plan to build a boatload of 1 bedroom and 2 bedroom flats? If we take the 21000 volume once again and assume the standard 2.4 children principle of a traditional family, do we not arrive at a more realistic 4772 homes required? Even that is not factoring in the ambiguous statement of ' If successful this would reduce historic patterns of migration from Newcastle to North Tyneside and support the stable level of growth set out in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1)' however is slightly more realistic than the figures I have seen in this document! | | New Housing | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898964 | | | LP20151067 | 2. I live in Benton and I think the level of already approved and proposed housing development is completely excessive. The Rising Sun Country Park is being gradually | | New Housing | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and | Indicative plans for potential development are included within the pre-submission policies map. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | surrounded by housing estates, the land opposite Gosforth Park is already doomed and any open space along the Whitley Road is now being proposed for development. The plan talks in some places about maintaining separation between the different settlements but this is already almost lost. There are oddities such as a "settlement buffer" around Murton which will see it peculiarly stranded in a sea of housing estates, while any open land between Benton, Longbenton and Wallsend is being sacrificed under this plan so there is no buffer at all. | | | sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | |
| 899290 | | | LP20151121 | I object to the development at site 139 because 1) it will be directly across the path of a wildlife corridor feeding into the Rising Sun Country Park 2) will add to the traffic congestion on Whitley Road 3) will be one more lost green space in an area that is rapidly losing all its green spaces. | | New Housing | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | Indicative plans for potential development are included within the pre-submission policies map. |
| 805554 | | | LP20151219 | The council has already failed to sufficiently defend the called in application by persimmon homes to build on the land next to the rising sun hill to the north east of station road. To identify the site on the north west side of station road for further housing is totally unacceptable. There will be no natural boundary between communities and such a level of development will oppress existing residents. The land should be protected from development and if it does have to be used at all then creative outdoor leisure space would be a better option. The council should focus | | New Housing | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | Indicative plans for potential development are included within the pre-submission policies map. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | on redeveloping run down property in the borough and work harder and more creatively to develop brownfield sites. Our infrastructure around the Wallsend/Benton/Holystone area can not cope with this level of development and I see no credible proposals that would deal with increased traffic, the number of families with school age children requiring school places etc . The narrow and silo approach to management of traffic means that only the immediate vicinity would be considered to attempt to manage traffic flow when the bottle necks would be created further along the chain e.g. station road A1058 roundabout, coast road, Whitley road and into the Newcastle authority area. | | | | |
| 898961 | | | LP20151262 | The need for additional housing should not be at the expense of the minimal, but very valuable areas of greenfield land that remain in the vicinity of Benton, Forest Hall and Wallsend. The network of tracks around, and leading to, the Rising Sun Country Park provide numerous benefits for people from the surrounding area. As a parent myself I know that they provide a safe environment for families to introduce their children to cycling and encourage families to 'get out for a walk'. The areas also allow many children the only opportunity they may get to experience a less 'built up', more natural environment. The unchecked development of the areas around the Rising Sun Park will undoubtedly put people off (or prevent them) making the most of the network of paths which can only have an adverse affect on | | New Housing | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identified objectively assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. Alongside this the Local Plan sets out a range of policy seeking to protect the wildlife value, character and environment of the Borough. | Indicative plans for potential development are included within the pre-submission policies map. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | quality of life and health of residents. Alternative brownfield sites for housing should be considered in the first instance and more imaginative methods of providing the housing numbers investigated (different estate layouts, etc). Furthermore, in the past 10 years the individual identity of the various areas within North Tyneside has largely been eroded due to the extensive building of houses from Earsdon, Northumberland Park, Shiremoor and Palmersville. Now the continued building of homes around Whitely Park and Station Road will see further merging of individual communities. Surely the retention of these local identities is another strong reason to reject any further building on greenfield sites within the area. | | | | |
| 901271 | | RESIDENT | LP20152191 | The building of 650 homes at the top of Station Road, despite you trying to blame developers shows the Councils ineptness and/or complicity. Previously standing on the top of the Rising sun Hill was truly like being in the countryside - now totally spoilt. | | New Housing | Comments noted. The application for Station Road was refused at planning committee. The application then went to the planning inspectorate who approved it. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015464 | As regards gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople provision, we note that paragraph 7.99 confirms that there is no identified need for any such provision in North Tyneside, consequent to your updated 2014 accommodation needs assessment. | | Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 878592 | | | LP20153 | The key challenge will be to attract individuals and families who can rebalance the economy. This means high tech, high skilled individuals. And the places we are competing with are Edinburgh, the South East, as well as areas closer to home. I would have thought the last thing we want to do is build lots of mid range | | Type of Housing: Housing Provision for a Diverse Borough | The Local Plan represents just one part of the Council's role in supporting the availability of land to ensure the potential for growth in the Borough can be met. This provision must be co-ordinated by other work under taken by the Council in Business Investment and Regeneration. At a wider | None |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | housing estates but instead the challenge is to put ourselves in the shoes of the talent (& their spouses) who live in the affluent south east (or overseas) who we need to attract and what the brochure would need to look like to persuade them to move. I don't know how one, as a planner, creates components of somewhere like a Bath or an Islington closer to home. I don't know what standards can be written in that are quantifiable but it is critical to include these as developers (& some politicians) will push for maximum profit, which means maximum volume at lowest cost. So set the bar high. Something like, 'all housing will be of a standard that would be recognised by RIBA as reaching a level suitable for consideration for nomination for a regional award'. Presumably their team have criteria or guidance they use when they assess ? e.g. see http://www.architecture.com/RIBA/Awards/RIBANationalAwards/Judging2015.aspx . Could this be used ? | | | level ensuring residents have the skills to support innovation and the borough infrastructure, attractive environment, safety and quality of life are all maintained are crucial to working towards the Council's aim of creating a thriving, prosperous borough for residents. | |
| 890457 | | RESIDENT | LP2015145 | If new homes are acquired by buy-to-let landlords they will maintain house prices and not increase the number of affordable homes to buy. Will the Council exercise any power they might have to prevent this? | | Type of Housing: Housing Provision for a Diverse Borough | Comment noted. There are no powers within planning to control this. | None. |
| 890535 | | | LP2015151 | would also like to know how many of the proposed housing will be affordable or will they be more oversized overpriced 'Town houses'. | | Type of Housing: Housing Provision for a Diverse Borough | Proposed policy on Affordable Housing sets out the aim for a Borough-wide target for at least 25% of all new homes to be affordable. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151099 | Green Party Homes for Life and Carbon Neutral housing should be prioritised so that (a) people don't have to move if they develop mobility problems during their lives, and (b) insulation and energy generation are built into new homes reducing carbon emissions and energy bills for those who live in them. | | Type of Housing: Housing Provision for a Diverse Borough | The Local Plan supports effective design to reduce climate change along with a SPD on Design. Housing standards are also managed through Building Regulations. A new policy will be introduced that reflects new Government requirements for housing standards, including making homes accessible and adaptable. | New policy "Housing Standards" added. |
| 805471 | | | LP20151125 | With the growing older population there seems a significant lack of consideration in the provision of a larger percentage of suitable accommodation for this age group. With the right to buy scheme the local authority have sold its housing stock therefore social housing needs remain critical and this is not significantly addressed either. Finally the lack of single bedroom and two bedroom property requires more investment so that those on benefits do have choice. Mixing the proposed developments re social housing and private housing is sensible but may well prove a barrier to those who are able to afford their own properties and desire a better environment rather than buying on a huge estate or development. | | Type of Housing: Housing Provision for a Diverse Borough | The Local Plan includes a range of policies to deliver a range of housing types and sizes to accommodate all needs, including regarding affordable housing, Council homes and a range of housing sizes based on the latest available evidence of housing needs. The SHMA has been used as part of the evidence base to inform housing tenure and type mix. A new policy will be introduced that reflects new Government requirements for housing standards, including making homes accessible and adaptable. | New policy "Housing Standards" added. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151352 | Policy DM7:14. Protecting existing housing stock. CPRE broadly supports this policy. | | S 7.1 Improving the Quality of Existing Housing Stock | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893226 | | RESIDENT | LP2015314 | It is disgusting how you are planning on building more homes on such small amounts of green space nestled in amongst housing estates these small green spaces are used for children to play! | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Comments noted. The Local Plan outlines North Tyneside's green space provision and standards requirements and aims regarding green infrastructure. In line with the NPPF, these policies support the loss of green space when there is sufficient green space | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | in the area to meet needs or where it can be replaces elsewhere. | |
| 895885 | | RESIDENT | LP2015578 | I strongly disagree with the proposed development of Killingworth Moor. 3000 houses at Murton/New York and 2000 houses at Killingworth/Moor and an employment Site I.e. offices, factories etc and high school, junior school, retail shops etc. This is an over development of both sites, the roads at peak times are gridlocked at present I.e. the A191,B1322, Shiremoor bye pass also the B1505 (Great Lime Road), A191(Whitley Road - Holystone roundabout. As far as I can see there is office blocks standing empty in Cobalt and Balliol and quorum Business developments so why build more. Why not build houses on green belt land in North West area as surplus school places exist In this area and Killingworth schools is at maximum capacity now. Apart from the above what about the destruction to wildlife that exists there and loss of good farm land. Once again I would strongly object to the above proposal. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Comprehensive Masterplans, in support of the strategic allocations policy, are being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the sites in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links.</p> <p>Any change to the Green Belt, both addition and deletion, must be proposed through the Local Plan process. In line with NPPF, in order to make such a change exceptional circumstances must be identified. A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to support the Local Plan and this concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries.</p> | |
| 808139 | | RESIDENT | LP2015644 | Whilst I appreciate the future needs for affordable housing, sacrificing one of the only truly Greenfield sites left within the borough because it is an easy solution is not sound management. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 803472 | | RESIDENT | LP2015692 | Build on land after "eyesore" properties have been demolished - lots of empty properties and derelict land which could be used. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | No amendments proposed |
| 898751 | | | LP2015905 | Myself and my family strongly and vehemently object to the use of greenfield sites for the building of houses. We object to the loss of vital green spaces that contribute to the well being of the population of North Tyneside. Losing green spaces has an incredibly detrimental effect on the physical and mental health of the population. Also, the damage to wildlife is totally unforgivable. We have already destroyed so many habitats of our native animals, birds and insects and this damage is irreversible. We our destroying the environment around us. Finally, the extra pressures new housing puts on roads and amenities has not been properly planned for. Recently, new houses have been built behind Blue Flames and next to Whitley Road. As in all other recent developments in North Tyneside, these houses are incredibly ugly and built in highly inefficient way. Houses are built | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan,. A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see the Local Plan and the IDP for further detail. The Local Plan includes a range of policies to deliver new development which is attractively | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | a foot apart so they can be sold as 'Detached' even though this is a complete waste of building materials. They are given small gardens, and there is very little green area included in the plans. Not only are houses being built in the wrong areas, they are very badly designed and poorly planned. We would like to specifically object to the plans to build houses near the Rising Sun Country Park for all the reasons listed above. | | | designed. | |
| 898964 | | | LP20151070 | The plan mentions that there are 993 properties classified as long term vacant. These should be looked at before open space is irreversibly committed to new housing. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | 993 homes are approximately 1% of the total housing stock in North Tyneside. A long term vacant property is any home that is vacant for over 6 mnths. It is important that all such homes are brought back into use and the Council proactively works to tackle issues of long term vacant properites. However, there will always be an element of long term and vacant property as homes are left unoccupied folowing death, absentee or second home ownership, periods of refurbishment etc... As such it would not be a robust approach to calculating housing needs to assume there will no longer be long term vacant property in the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 675953 | | RESIDENT | LP20151122 | My wife and I [and many others] are extremely pleased to see that the allotment area behind Midhurst Road - site 14- is not now shown as a potential development area. We hope it remains this way and can be returned to a useful and productive space for the community. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899433 | | | LP20151265 | However we object strongly to the inclusion of sites 17 and 110 as housing and industrial land respectively. If these sites are built on, this will unacceptably reduce the green space | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Comments noted, the Local Plan must respond to the identifiyed objectivel assessed needs for development. This means a range of brownfield and | Within the Local Plan, allocations for mahjor development are also supported by indicative |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>between Benton/Forest Hall and Wallsend, especially as the large field to the east of Station Road (to be called "East Benton Rise") has already been allocated (in defiance of local opposition) to a large number of houses. It is essential to the physical and mental health of residents that green spaces between housing estates are protected, as all residents should have access to un-crowded green areas within a short walking distance of their homes. Such green spaces are also critical for wildlife in the borough. Furthermore, traffic problems are already bad, especially at rush hours, and will become increasingly severe when the currently approved additional housing is completed. We are aware that improvements are underway to some local junctions (e.g. Four Lane Ends) but these can only have a moderate beneficial effect. The Metro is already operating at virtually its maximum capacity at such times so cannot be relied upon to help further in this respect. In our opinion it is therefore absolutely essential that these areas are left as open green spaces. We realise that we need to suggest alternatives. As regards Site 11 now Site E010 (currently proposed for employment uses) we believe that this is unnecessary as it is a relatively small area whose removal from the plans would have minimal adverse effect on the overall area available. As regards housing on site 17, if additional houses are really required in the numbers proposed (about which we have some doubts) then we would recommend that all possible brownfield sites</p> | | | <p>sustainable greenfield sites are required to be identified for development across the Borough. It is important in bringing forward those developmetns that the right infrastructure and measures are in place to protect the character and environment of north tyneside and the Local Plan and infrastructure delivery plan set out a range of policies and requirements to secure this in a pro-active manner.</p> | <p>mapping showing potential access points and possible strategic areas of open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | should be used before any more green areas are lost. If that should really still be inadequate we would reluctantly suggest allocating an equivalent area of green belt land in the north of the borough. This goes against our instinct but, in our opinion, would be a lesser evil than removing more of the green "breathing space" which currently separates residential and industrial areas. | | | | |
| 899953 | | RESIDENT | LP20151555 | The houses proposed by developers should meet the needs of the targeted housing stock shortfall and should include small terraced housing schemes with outside space which is affordable. Developers are maximising profit by building executive homes with large price tags and apartments with no or limited outside space. I feel that rather than implicating whole areas as development sites in the Local plan it would be more pertinent to allocate a number of smaller sites across the borough to avoid significant impacts. I would have hoped North Tyneside would want to avoid a situation like the developments around Kingston Park where developers have provided a large New town development where no-one wants to live as they are large executive houses with no amenities such as shop or schools. I hope my comments are taken in to consideration as I feel very strongly that this approach is not in the best interests of the residents of North Tyneside. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Comments noted. The mix of housing tenures and types that are supported by the Local Plan have been informed by evidence including the Strategic Housing market Assessment (SHMA). The Local Plan puts forward a range of housing sites of varying sizes. These have been identified through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The SHLAA illustrates that there are not enough small sites throughout the Borough to meet our objectively assessed housing needs up to 2032 and sustainable available larger sites have to be looked to also. The two strategic sites in the Local Plan have had Concept Plans prepared and will be subject to further masterplanning to ensure they are well integrated and have the facilities required to support the population. | No amendments proposed. |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151730 | 21. The HBF support the amendments to part "c" of this policy from the previous iteration in the winter 2013/14 consultation. These amendments conform to our comments at | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | this time. | | | | |
| 900308 | Places for People | | LP20151781 | (Comments with input from Urban Splash) We agree with prioritising the use of brownfield land for development. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151796 | We note with interest Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) "" Strategic Housing, and welcome its development principles, which state that the distribution of housing development will be guided by its impact on the environment and the requirements of essential infrastructure, amongst other criteria. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 469684 | | RESIDENT | LP20151843 | Housing in North Tyneside has 'mushroomed' during the 19 years I have lived here. Do we really need to use up greenfield land? | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan,. A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | No amendments proposed. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152032 | Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) is generally supported however from the start this policy should be seeking in line with the requirements of the NPPF to meet the "FULL" objectively assessed housing needs for North Tyneside. While this seems minor the nuanced difference is to ensure full accordance and consistency with the NPPF. Sub section (c) of this policy however is of some concern. As previously stated in our reps last year the mixture of Brownfield development sites and | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Comments noted... reference to a 5% or 20% buffer is not considered necessary within this policy. The buffer is a mechanism to ensure sufficient housing delivery and is clearly set out within NPPF. | Reference to "full" added to the policy. Reference to a "rolling five year land supply" seperated from the prority for brownfield development. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | achieving the 5 year land supply is miss leading and contrary to clear policy. The delivery of Brown Field development subject to viability should be a requirement and separate to this should be the requirement to ensure a 5 year rolling land supply in accordance with the NPPF. The 5 year land supply position within this policy should also make quite clear that in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF the application of a buffer of either 5 or 20% should be applied dependent on the delivery rate as recorded in AMR. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152074 | RE New Site: Russell Square. Our client supports the recognition in the supporting text to Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) (paragraph 7.4), as highlighted by local strategies and documents, of the importance of new housing development in the Borough. It is considered that, as the inclusion of the site within the Green Belt is not justified, the site provides suitable housing land, which is deliverable in the short term to help meet the objectively assessed needs of the Borough, and would reflect the key priorities outlined in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1). | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | The comment is noted. The Council has undertaken an assessment of its Green Belt as a whole. The Council has established that there are for this plan period no exceptional circumstances that would require an amendment to the Green Belt. | No amendments proposed. |
| 878767 | | | LP201517 | It is pleasing that the Plan recognises there is a need to reduce the cumulative impact that the increasing number of residential institutions is having on Whitley Bay town centre. (Paragraph 7.82). It is also pleasing to note that "...the aim is to reduce the concentration of these developments and support Whitley Bay to become a sustainable community". The wording of the start of policy statement AS7.1 (now S4.1)3 should | | AS 7.1 (now S 4.1)3 Residential Institutions in Whitley Bay | Comments noted. The aim of the policy is to better manage the numbers of residential institutions in Whitley Bay, not to impose a blanket refusal for applications for them in the town. The suggested policy amendments would not reflect the aim of the policy or be consistent with positive planning. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | therefore be amended to reflect this stated aim and should read, "Development of further residential institutions will not be acceptable within Whitley Bay and will only be acceptable in other locations provided they meet the following criteria:....." | | | | |
| 805252 | | RESIDENT | LP201543 | I am dismayed and alarmed at the rapid amount of house building and road "improvements" taking place across the region. The loss of green space even if these are "only" fields has been dramatic since I moved to the area from Northumberland 20 years ago. But it is just as bad there. I feel completely hemmed in by concrete and every journey by car seems to be busy no matter which road I take out of Wallsend. This is only going to get worse over a 10 year period due to the development on Station road fields or East Benton Rise as it will soon be known. I am devastated that this has been overturned by Eric Pickles despite numerous objections. It will have a detrimental impact on every journey I take and the thought of years of mess, noise and delays is just awful. I feel like moving out of the area but to where? | | S 7.1 (now S 4.1) Strategic Housing | Comments noted. The Local Plan encourages the use of brownfield land and contains many potential developments sites on brownfield land. However evidence on population growth and housing needs means that we also need to look towards sustainable green field sites | No amendments proposed. |
| 444503 | | RESIDENT | LP201588 | My comments regarding your plans , I have lived in Cullercoats over 40 years, you give flats in the village to the wrong people (check them out). My problem is to wait for what is happening in the future. | | S 7.1 (now S 4.1) Strategic Housing | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 804904 | | | LP2015254 | Point C refers to the use of brownfield land, yet all of the land around Murton is (according to your own synthetic categorisation) greenfield. Is this not a contradiction to your own objectives? I believe your own documents in 9.39 suggest | | S 7.1 (now S 4.1) Strategic Housing | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2and S7.1 (now Policies S1.4 and S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | that vacant land has been identified and is considered a problem in the borough yet building on the greenfield is obviously put forward ahead of it due to the cost differential of putting in place a policy of ensuring this vacant land was used or bought out by the council! Similarly, why is your primary objective to provide new homes when (according to your own stats) 3.3% of the homes in the borough are vacant, with ~1k LTV (Long Term Vacant). Although this will not solve your hyper-inflated problem of 'not having enough homes in the borough to meet your plan', having a strong policy in place to reduce this number would make a significant dent! | | | wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. The role that long-term empty homes can play in providing additional housing is identified through the Local Plan and Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) includes the objective to bring empty homes back into use. An allowance for windfall development is made through the Local Plan, based on past trends and evidenced through the SHLAA, which provides a small proportion of the total housing requirement to 2032. This windfall allowance includes supply from bringing empty/vacant homes back into use. | |
| | | | LP2015296 | Greenfield land is attractive because it does not need remediation. A debate needs to be had on whether to spend the money needed to remediate land. It would be better use of money than stupid wars, saving banks or foreign aid. | | S 7.1 (now S 4.1) Strategic Housing | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| | | | LP2015310 | The plan needs to support a full range of housing which is suitable for all ages. This includes ensuring new residential development is to 'lifetime homes' standards - it is important that residents have options available in later life, not just care homes or sheltered housing facilities, the housing stock needs to be flexible to allow people to stay in their own homes. | | S 7.1 (now S 4.1) Strategic Housing | Comments noted. A new policy will be introduced that reflects new Government requirements for housing standards, including making homes accessible and adaptable. | New policy "Housing Standards" added. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 890859 | | RESIDENT | LP2015177 | Renovating poor housing stock and/or empty homes prioritised in order to reduce numbers on Murton and Killingworth Moor. | | S 7.1 Improving the Quality of Existing Housing Stock | Comments noted. Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) states that The Council will work to ensure the Borough's existing houses and residential areas remain healthy, safe, attractive and sustainable places in which to live. | No amendments proposed. |
| 467670 | | RESIDENT | LP2015961 | There are lots of poor housing still in Wallsend. Surely these can be update. | | S 7.1 Improving the Quality of Existing Housing Stock | Comments noted. This is recognised and aimed for through this policy. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805282 | | | LP20151003 | I am concerned and disgusted that you intend to build on small green spaces between existing housing that are used by local residents for recreation and wildlife for homes. Why not regenerate existing homes that are in need of redevelopment? To squeeze 400 homes onto the field at Annitsford Farm is madness when the existing 'new' homes by Gentoo on The Wyndings have not all sold yet despite the development being finished months ago! The impact of the noise, mess and extra traffic on local residents should also not be underestimated whilst the building is going ahead not to mention the increased traffic on local roads and stress on local services such as doctors surgeries after the homes are finished. I object in the strongest terms at the development of this site. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan,. A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared alongside the Local Plan to manage the delivery of necessary infrastructure for the future. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898981 | | | LP20151115 | The concept of a "sustainable green belt development" is a non-sequitur. A green belt location is a shared resource for the population of the borough, and a valuable | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Comments noted. The Local Plan does not suggest any allocations for development in the Green Belt. In accordance with the NPPF, a policy is included to assess any | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | location for wildlife. Once built on, it does not magically "renew" - it is gone, and gone forever. How this can be seen as sustainable I'm not sure. As a result, I believe any council plan should work in priority order, starting with the worst brownfield sites and working towards the green belt sites only when all brownfield sites have been exhausted and there is clear evidence that there is still demand for housing and that increasing the population of the borough would increase the standard of living of people in the borough. | | | proposals that may come forward for development in the Green Belt; this policy has the presumption against development but acknowledges (again, in accordance with the NPPF) that some development that would not harm the objectives of the Green Belt may be acceptable. | |
| 898981 | | | LP20151116 | I would certainly be grateful to see this plan address some of the core structural issues which underlie some of the need for housing stock. For example 1. Housing nationwide is grossly underused. There are significant numbers of homes going unoccupied and development companies often build whatever is most profitable in the long term (i.e. executive homes) rather than what is needed. Personally I would like to see the concept of affordable homes being brought under some form of public ownership or a framework to enforce that only the types of homes required are given planning permission. 2. Property is seen as an investment leading to an increase in buy to let and second homes. This is partly due to government policy driving down interest rates on savings through QE, leading to savers seeking yield through property investment. It would certainly be possible to combat this through taxation on buy to let properties, hopefully reducing the use of homes as an investment vehicle, before we follow the route of London. 3. Other countries | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | The Local Plan encourages and sets out requirements for the provision of affordable homes for development both as part of private developer led schemes, registered providers and the Council. Overall, the Local Plan must work within the national context for planning policy and the economy in order to be robust and secure the development that is needed for the residents of the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | do not have the obsession with owning homes, with large percentages of the population in European countries living in long term rental accommodation. Germany only has 39% home ownership compared with 60% plus in the UK as the state controls long term rents, meaning that it cannot be used as an investment vehicle through buy to let landlords. By considering some of these issues rather than blindly building more houses, we may be able to save more of the regions valuable green belt land. | | | | |
| 899452 | | | LP20151279 | The housing planned for Killingworth Moor still seems too much. The loss of land at is going to put more strain on the road system and apparently Holystone School is already oversubscribed. Will the waggonway still run through the new housing estate? | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Comments noted. Killingworth Moor has been identified as a strategic site to deliver the homes North Tyneside requires to 2032. For the site, a Concept Plan has been developed that takes into account the infrastructure requirements and the constraints the site has. | An indicative Concept Plan has been identified for |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151344 | Policy S7:1 Strategic Housing. CPRE can support this policy and welcomes the stress on identifying council owned land, brownfield sites and sustainable greenfield sites, and the earlier commitment not to delete any Green Belt. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151489 | Land ownership should not be relevant to the identification of land for development. In turn land is either brownfield or greenfield, as such there is not a need to reference vacant and derelict land. It is therefore suggested the first sentence of the policy be revised to state;"The objectively assessed housing needs of North Tyneside will be met through the provision of sufficient specific deliverable housing sites whilst making best use of existing housing stock and reflecting the | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | The wording of policy S7.1 (now S4.1) is such that it identifies as a priority the delivery of brownfield land in accordance with national planning policy. Further amendments relating to stating the housing allocation is a minimum and should not prevent positive consideration of windfall site is not considered necessary. Policy setting out the overall housing requirement clearly establishes that this is a minimum target. Meanwhile additional | Reference to "vacant and derelict" removed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | following key priorities "It is suggested criterion c be revised to state;"The reuse of brownfield land in preference to the development of greenfield land, whilst taking into consideration the viability of land for development and ensuring the Borough maintains a rolling five year supply of deliverable housing sites". The above would accord with the key planning principle of encouraging the re-use of previously developed land in preference to greenfield land. The policy should additionally state that the housing allocation is a minimum and not a maximum. It should further state that the housing allocation should not provide the justification for the refusal of windfall housing proposals that fall within the guidance set out for Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments. | | | policy is in place to guide the positive consideration of sites for development including those not allocated in the Local Plan. | |
| 803900 | Northumberland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151531 | The Council supports the reference to working closely with neighbouring authorities to ensure that planned housing growth across the three north of Tyne authorities is complementary. The Council would welcome the opportunity to continue to work together on population, housing and economic growth as part of the Duty to Cooperate discussions, to ensure that our finalised SHMAs and respective Local Plans recognise and reflect cross boundary relationships. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899194 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | | LP20151645 | NWL broadly supports the strategy of ensuring that an adequate range of sites is made available across the Borough for housing development. In particular, NWL supports criteria a), which seeks to ensure that enough new homes are provided to meet | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | both current and future needs. | | | | |
| 830576 | Taylor Wimpey | DEVELOPER | LP20151982 | Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) deals with the Council's proposed strategic housing policy. The general principles of the policy are supported. although it is considered the opening sentence to the policy should confirm the Council will meet the 'full' objectively assessed needs. This avoids any potential ambiguity and is consistent with the wording contained within the NPPF. | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Comment noted. | Reference to "full" added to the policy. |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152014 | PLEASE NOTE FIGURES 1-10 ARE IN THE ATTACHMENT Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) "" Strategic Housing and Policy S7.2 "" Housing Figures Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) sets out a strategic housing policy and S7.2 sets out a requirement to deliver an average of 792 dwellings per annum between 2011/12 and 2031/32. However, we note that the plan period will be 15 years from 2016/17 to 2032. Paragraph 7.10 of the Local Plan states that the detailed population and economic modelling work which supports the requirement is set out in the 2014 SHMA. The scenarios assessed include household projections, economic-led projections and alternative migration sensitivities. Table 3 of the Local Plan summarises the results of the modelling work with annual requirements ranging from 282 dwellings per annum (dpa) needed to support natural change (i.e. no migration) up to 1,789 dpa needed to achieve the higher economic forecast. The chosen scenario is "closest to trend based OAN, and supports the forecast medium job growth, this is based on a combination of scenarios; | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | Comments providing a robust consideration of the proposed housing growth in North Tyneside are welcomed. 1) What do the latest household projections conclude should be the starting point for an objective assessment of needs? Overall the previous set of household projections utilising an average of the 2008 and 2011 based household projections have been update to the 2012 based projections - published after completion of the 2015 Consultation Draft Local Plan. The preferred housing requirement for North Tyneside has consequently increased from 792 homes per year to 828 homes per year - reflecting the stated changes in household formation identified in the comment. 2) Are there local demographic factors which indicate a departure from household projections is necessary? The assessment of household need undertaken by the Council is informed by expertly prepared household forecasts. This tested a range of scenarios including the benchmark subnational projections, migration led projections over | reflecting updated household forecasts 2012 the housing requirement has been amended to 828 homes per year. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>jobs led medium (lower net out commute), 10 Year Migration Trend, and Sub-National Population Projection (SNPP). This option results in a need for 792 homes per year" (paragraph 7.21 of the Local Plan). It is concluded that this scenario will result in job growth of around 654 jobs per annum. The consortium has tested the various components of the Council's choice of housing requirement, as follows: 1) What do the latest household projections conclude should be the starting point for an objective assessment of needs? 2) Are there local demographic factors which indicate a departure from household projections is necessary? 3) Are adjustments for economic growth required and if so what level of growth is appropriate? 4) Is an uplift to take account of market signals justified? 5) Is the Council's assumption that out-commuting will change justified? What do the latest household projections conclude should be the starting point for an objective assessment of needs? The 2012-based Household Projections (2012 HP) show that North Tyneside is projected to grow more and faster than any other local authority in Tyne and Wear and Northumberland (see figures 1 and 2). The 2012 Household Projections (which include the 2012 SNPP but crucially update headship rates from the Interim 2011 HP) project growth in households of 17% over the period 2011 to 2031. This is significantly more than is projected in any of the Tyne and Wear authorities which collectively are projected to grow by around 12%, with Northumberland at</p> | | | <p>five and ten year periods and a range of alternatives considering the implications of differing levels of job growth, commuting and migration. Following the update to the 2012 household forecasts the Council do not consider the projection to be a departure. 3) Are adjustments for economic growth required and if so what level of growth is appropriate? General support for the Council's assessment that job growth is likely to outstrip population growth in North Tyneside over the plan period - influencing the balance of commuting flows are welcomed. The implications and approach of our neighbours - particular at Northumberland and Newcastle forms an important component of discussions through the Duty to Co-operate. 4) Is an uplift to take account of market signals justified? The Council considers that the 2014 SHMA provides a suitably robust assessment of housing needs and housing market signals. The SHMA includes consideration of conditions in neighbouring authorities and an assessment of the relative performance of the borough. The overall assessment that market signals indicate the housing market in North Tyneside is "tight" is broadly agreed with. However, the assumption that in such circumstances a broad 10% uplift should simply be added to the evidence based scenarios for growth is not considered a robust solution. In addition, attention is drawn to the moderate market pressures described at a time when housing delivery</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>just 9% growth. Figure 1: Household Projections for Tyne and Wear and Northumberland (Source 2012 Household Projections) Figure 2: Indexed (2011=1) Household Projections for Tyne and Wear and Northumberland (Source 2012 Household Projections) The household projections update the Council's "Sub-national Population Projection 2012' scenario which underestimates growth significantly (by around 45 dwellings per annum or 900 across the plan period). Given both of these scenarios utilise the same population input it is clear that the household formation rates (headship) in the latest projections have been increased significantly. In fact, a review of headship rates taken from the 2011 HP (which is used by the SHMA and by extension the LPCD) and the newly published 2012 HP reveals that the former significantly underestimates household formation in older cohorts. In particular figures 3, 4 and 5 set out how household formation is projected change in the 2011 HP1 and 2012 HP and show that the SHMA will underestimate the propensity for these cohorts to form new households and consequently underestimate housing needs as a whole, particular as the population is ageing. Figure 3 : Household formation rates of 65 to 74 year olds (Source 2012 Projections) 1 The 2011 HP project to 2021 and therefore are projected forward ten years to 2031 on the basis of the best fit trend for the projection 2011 to 2021. Figure 4: Household formation rates of 55 to 59 year olds (Source 2012 Household Projections)</p> | | | <p>within North Tyneside have ranged between 300 and 450 new homes per year. Through the Local Plan period an annual average rate of 828 homes per year is proposed and being planned for. There is no evidence of the performance of the housing market in North Tyneside with such a rate of housing delivery over the long term. Such an uplift may therefore be considered as part of the process of monitoring, implementation and delivery of the Local Plan - but is not appropriate to adjust the housing target itself.</p> <p>5) Is the Council's assumption that out-commuting will change justified? The broad support for the assumption that rates of out-commuting will change is welcomed. Again the implications of this is being considered and has formed a key part of our engagement through the duty to cooperate.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Figure 5: Household formation rates of 60 to 64 year olds (Source 2012 Household Projections) The starting point for an assessment of housing needs is the 2012 HP Projections which project a need for in excess of 805 dwellings per annum. In addition, new headship rates published with the 2012 HP should be utilised in the modelling work for all other scenarios including the economic-led scenarios. It is likely this will increase the overall need for housing. Are there local demographic factors which indicate a departure from household projections is necessary? Figure 6 sets out net migration in North Tyneside over time. It is clear that net migration has fluctuated significant since 2001/2 with a high of 1,112 persons in 2008 to a low of - 110 persons in 2012. Given these fluctuations, it is considered appropriate to take into account longer term trends. Another factor which has not been picked up by past migration trends or the 2012 SNPP is the influence of Un-attributable Population Change ("UPC"). UPC is the difference between the population estimate rolled forward from the 2001 Census and the Population estimate following the 2011 Census. In North Tyneside the Census revealed that there was an additional 1,800 people living in the Borough than was originally estimated. Whilst it is not possible to fully and accurately account for how these people were mis-accounted for, it is likely that at least some if not most were under-recorded migrants. Figure 4 therefore adjusts past net migration to take account of UPC</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>which has a significant and positive impact on past trends.2 2 This phenomena only affects the years between the Census as UPC was calculated using the 2011 Census. The 2012 SNPP does not account for UPC. If UPC has been a significant component of population change it is important to account for it in the demographic analysis of the SHMA. Figure 6: Migration estimates from the 2013 Revised Mid Year Estimates (Source ONS 2013 MYE) To assess the potential impact of considering longer term trends, figure 7 sets out net migration for a range of time period and include UPC where appropriate. It is clear that the SNPP (which is 2012 based and includes trends from the 5/6 years from 2006/7) contains a period of high migration when compared to the 12 year and most recent 6 year average. However, when UPC is included, this increases past migration averages significantly. Figure 7: Average Migration Rates from 2001/2 to 2012/13 Revised Mid Year Estimates (Source ONS 2013 MYE) It is therefore considered that the 2012 SNPP and the 2012 Household Projections which utilise the household projections could underestimate past migration on account of longer term trends and UPC. An upward adjustment on the basis of this evidence is therefore justified. Are adjustments for economic growth required and if so what level of growth is appropriate? The Local Plan (at paragraph 7.22) states that 792 dpa will support a significant increase in the local economy of 654 jobs per annum. GVA has reviewed 2014 Experian Forecasts which</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>conclude job growth of over 760 jobs per annum is forecast over the period 2011 to 2031, an increase of 16% over the job growth assumed in by the Local Plan. This level of economic growth forecast by Experian is the baseline forecast for the area and is considered to be principal projection for the Borough (i.e. is comparable to the 'medium growth' scenario put forward by the Council. Figure 8 shows that North Tyneside is forecast to grow at the fastest rate of any of the Tyne and Wear authorities (incl. Northumberland). This lends some credence to the Council's proposition that out-commuting will change over the plan period. This is because, as economic opportunities in the Borough become stronger relative to South East Northumberland and Newcastle upon Tyne residents who currently work in those areas will be more and more inclined to pursue local employment opportunities. Figure 8: Indexed forecasted employment growth 2011 to 2031 (Source Experian) Overall there is a justification for a greater increase in the level of jobs planned for through the plan given up to date economic forecast. It is also likely that commuting will change in response to the significant levels of growth forecast in the Borough (this is discussed further below). Is an uplift to take account of market signals justified? The 2014 SHMA at table 4.7 sets out an assessment of housing market signals. This is not in line with the PPG. The PPG states that an assessment of market signals should be a relative one, comparing the performance of the local housing market to that of the</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>wider housing market area and areas with comparable socio-economic characteristics. The 2014 SHMA does not undertake such an assessment and is therefore not considered robust. Notwithstanding, it would appear that in terms of affordability (see figure 9), the change since 1997 has been largely in line with the that of the surrounding area with a worsening of 59% compared to 61% in Newcastle, 66% in Gateshead 53% in South Tyneside and 54% in Northumberland. Figure 9: Indexed affordability ratio change 1997 to 2013 (Source: DCLG Live Tables) In terms of median house price change (see figure 10) however, North Tyneside has experienced the fastest growth across the period 1996 to 2013 with a growth of 218% compared to 212% in Gateshead, 2014% in Newcastle upon Tyne, 210% in Northumberland. Figure 10: Indexed house price grown 1996 to 2012 (Source DCLG Live Tables) As described by the SHMA at paragraph 4.20, residential rents have been static, however vacancy rates are low and decreasing showing that demand is high relative to supply. Low vacancy rates increase friction in the housing market, reducing competition and compounding increasing house prices. They are symptomatic of a lack of supply relative to demand. Overall, whilst the picture is mixed, there would appear to be some indicators which are pointing to a "tight" housing market which requires additional supply to meet demand. The PPG states that a worsening trend in any of the indicators will require an upward adjustment to planned housing numbers compared to</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>those based solely on household projections. The 2012 HP are projecting an increase of around 805 dpa. The size of a market signals uplift is a matter of judgment, on which the PPG offers no specific advice. At an Examination in Public of Eastleigh's Local Plan (Hampshire) the EiP's Inspector's Preliminary Conclusions recommended a 10% uplift in response to market signals that indicated "modest' market pressures. Overall, given the issues associated with house increases house prices and falling vacancy rates, a modest increase in the region of 10% above household projections would seem appropriate. Is the Council's assumption that out-commuting will change justified? The housing and job requirement as set out in the Local Plan are predicated on a change in the commuting shift. On balance this is considered appropriate. Firstly, between the 2001 and 2011 Census, out-commuting fell in North Tyneside in response to an increase in local employment, particular business uses at the enterprise zone office parks at Quorum and Cobalt. This is detailed in the 2014 SHMA and its accompanying appendix by Edge Analytics. Secondly, the jobs economy in North Tyneside is forecast to grow at a faster rate than the surrounding area in future, further reducing the requirement for residents to leave the Borough for work. Notwithstanding, such a significant change in commuting rate will of course have an impact on the surrounding authorities and their housing / job balance. For example, Northumberland County Council is assuming</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>within their Core Strategy that out-commuting to Newcastle and North Tyneside will fall. There is potentially a conflict here in terms of the ability of each authority to house fewer and fewer of the subregions' workforce. Notwithstanding the evidence which would seem to justify a change in commuting in North Tyneside, a political agreement with the surrounding authorities through a Duty to Cooperate process should be made to ensure that at the sub-regional level, the spatial strategy each authority is pursuing is appropriate, justified and deliverable and meet full objectively assessed needs for the entire wider housing market area. A trajectory for new housing In paragraph 7.29 it is set out that the Council will apply a 5% buffer onto the requirement of 792 homes per annum. However, when considering paragraph 47 of NPPF and the Council's Annual Monitoring Report 2013 it is the consortium's view that the Council has persistently failed on an annual basis to meet requirements. With the exception of years 2004 "" 2008, the Council has failed to meet the housing requirement, including any of the years between 2008 and 2013. The recent under delivery, regardless of economic conditions, has been persistent and therefore under the terms of NPPF paragraph 47, the 20% buffer should be applied to the requirement. The Council will be aware of well established case law on this point including the Burbage appeal which sets out that economic conditions are not a justification for under delivery and also the Cotswold judgement where the frequency of</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the under delivery was a key factor in establishing whether to apply the 5% or 20% buffer. The consortium also considers that in table 8, the total supply should not include 100% of sites with planning consent (or minded to grant) because there is significant evidence to demonstrate that historically, not all houses consented are constructed. It has been widely accepted that a 10% discount should be applied to planning permissions to give a more accurate reflection of realistic supply. The implication of this, alongside the consortium's view that the OAN should be higher, is a requirement for increased allocations or numbers of houses proposed on existing allocations in the local plan including at Killingworth Moor. Conclusions on Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) and S7.2 Overall, it is consortium's view that the Council's requirement of 792 would not meet objectively assessed need. Household projections show that older person household are likely to form at a faster rate than assumed by the 2014 SHMA resulting in an increase in total household growth of around 6%. This will have an impact on all of the modelled scenarios. In total, the household projections indicate a need for around 805 dpa. Longer term demographic trends would seem appropriate as would the inclusion of UPC which increase the baseline demographic further. Up to date economic forecasts have revealed that the Council's chosen requirement would not meet the full needs of local businesses. An upward adjustment would be required to do so. Whilst the overall</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | picture with regard to market signals is mixed, there are signs of moderate market pressure. It is concluded that upward adjustment of 10% over household projections is justified, increasing the annual requirement to at least 885 dpa (notwithstanding the additional growth in the jobs target and or demographic needs). This is the current view of the consortium. Notwithstanding, the consortium reserve the right to comment further on additional information. The Council should apply a 20% rather than 5% buffer to the requirement recognising the persistent under delivery against the requirement. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152103 | RE New Site: Land to south of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn. Our client supports the recognition in the supporting text to Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) (paragraph 7.4), as highlighted by local strategies and documents, of the importance of new housing development in the Borough. It is considered that, as the inclusion of the site within the Green Belt is not justified, the site provides suitable and deliverable housing land to help meet the objectively assessed needs of the Borough, and would reflect the key priorities outlined in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1). | | S 7.1 Strategic Housing | The comment is noted. The Council has undertaken an assessment of its Green Belt as a whole. The Council has established that there are for this plan period no exceptional circumstances that would require an amendment to the Green Belt. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151310 | DM7.10 Large Executive Housing This policy is supported. | | DM 7.10 Large Executive Housing | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151351 | Policy DM7:10 Large Executive Housing: CPRE is not convinced of any robust evidence demonstrating the benefit of such housing to the Borough, and sees no need for this policy. We also perceive a risk that this policy could | | DM 7.10 Large Executive Housing | Comment noted. The North Tyneside SHMA indicates a continued need for larger properties whilst overall North Tyneside has a lower than average proportion of upper council tax band properties. However, the | Reference to executive housing is now included in a single Housing Type and Mix policy. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | make "exceptional circumstances" for off-site affordable housing (Policy DM7:6) routine and therefore not "exceptional". The corollary of executive gated estates is ghettos of social housing. | | | need for additional housing of all types, tenures and sizes is identified and supported through the Local Plan. | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152043 | Policy DM 7.10 sets out the Councils approach towards executive housing, this policy sets the evidence for requirement of specific schemes which Persimmon support in principle however we have the following concerns. The policy sets a maximum density threshold which is excessively low and does not account for development of executive housing which can still be achieved at a higher density. We agree that the overall size of units would have to be bigger to qualify as executive but don't agree that the density is an overriding factor. We propose that this policy be amended to remove the density requirement. | | DM 7.10 Large Executive Housing | Comment noted. The point regarding housing density for the definition of executive homes is recognised. Overall within the context of Local Plan delivery provision of executive homes is encouraged but the application of this policy will not compromise the ability of a developer to propose the development of large homes at a higher density. Therefore it is not considered necessary to amend the Councils definition of the form of development which it would consider as executive - for the purposes of the Local Plan and future monitoring. | Reference to executive housing is now included in a single Housing Type and Mix policy. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152162 | Policy DM7.11 - criterion (b) should require there to be no unjustified adverse impacts upon any heritage value the building or locality may possess. | | DM 7.11 Houses in Multiple Occupation | Comments noted. However we feel that the policies set out in the heritage assets chapter, that are applicable to all policies/proposals within the Plan, provide adequate protection to heritage assets. | No amendments proposed. |
| 588278 | | RESIDENT | LP2015424 | The choice of new housing for "older people" tends to be between bungalows and care homes with "Extra Care" in between. This perception of the needs of a very diverse demographic group is narrow and unambitious. A much greater variety of choice is needed including co-housing (as part of the self-build offer ?) this is an opportunity to release significant equity into the local economy as well as larger family homes through 'right-sizing' by this group. | | DM 7.12 Extra Care / Specialist Housing | Comment is noted. The policy seeks to support all forms of specialist housing to meet a diverse range of needs. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151311 | DM7.12 Extra Care/Specialist Housing This policy is supported. | | DM 7.12 Extra Care / Specialist Housing | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP201577 | The only places I have seen Travellers staying are: - Rosehill, by the, now defunct, Rose Inn. - Whitley Bay Links. | | DM 7.15 Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151353 | Policy DM7:15. Travellers. CPRE can support this policy, provided that the present and future need for such sites in the Borough has been fully and accurately estimated. | | DM 7.15 Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople | Support noted. The 2014 independently prepared Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment has been used in the preparation of the Local Plan, | No amendments proposed. |
| 803900 | Northumberland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151533 | The Council welcomes the recognition that there will continue to be cross border cooperation in relation to the provision for Gypsy and Travellers in paragraph 7.102. | | DM 7.15 Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 879298 | | RESIDENT | LP201531 | You can't sort out flooding problems for existing homes so how does building more homes higher up the valley helps us down here. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The North Tyneside Surface Water and Drainage Partnership has a detailed programme of flood attenuation that will address many issues of flooding across the borough (http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/426/how-council-handles-floods). Proposals for new development must ensure firstly that they do not increase flood risk for existing residents or the new property. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 879296 | | RESIDENT | LP201529 | Excessive planned residential development planned. Taking into account struggling road network in the area I am surprised development on such a scale has been agreed | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. In line with | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | | or is planned. | | | guidance, the starting point for determining this requirement is through consideration of the latest projections published by DCLG, which are derived from the ONS population forecasts. The full report is available to read on the Council website. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for residential development. | Forecasts 2012 |
| 890121 | | RESIDENT | LP201556 | I am deeply concerned about the continued "gobbling" up of our green spaces. Also, where I live, it's not just North Tyneside but also Newcastle Council plans for development which impact on the area. Traffic congestion is a significant issue and I dread to think of the impact on wildlife. I would suggest that all Council's in the area produce a combined development plan, so we can really assess the impacts down the line. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Comments noted. The plan aims to balance the environmental, social and economic demands of the borough. Green Infrastructure, biodiversity and green space provision policies are included to ensure such interests are given due consideration in the planning process. North Tyneside Council follow 'the duty to co-operate' as outlined in the NPPF. The duty to cooperate was created in the Localism Act 2011, and amends the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It places a legal duty on local planning authorities, county councils in England and public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local and Marine Plan preparation in the context of strategic cross boundary matters. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 890124 | | RESIDENT | LP201559 | Build as few houses as possible before we are all living in concrete; want all green spaces protected as much as possible for wildlife etc... Concerned about all the building starting to surround the Rising Sun Country Park, as with Killingworth Wildlife Lake - we cannot keep going forever, too many people - need population control. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Comments noted. The plan aims to balance the environmental, social and economic demands of the borough. Green Infrastructure, biodiversity and green space provision policies are included to ensure such interests are given due consideration in the planning process. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 890129 | | RESIDENT | LP201565 | It is a pity all the derelict shops on Whitley Road can't be turned into flats - for social | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Comment noted. The Local Plan does support the conversion of residential above | The objectively assessed housing requirement has |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | | housing. | | | shops and recognises the role that residential can play in supporting a vibrant town centre. | been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 396697 | | RESIDENT | LP201572 | New housing is a good idea, but only if affordable for people on normal wages. Usually people say "affordable" but homes start at Â£180,000. An affordable home for me is Â£100,000 and I don't want to live in a flat forever. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The Local Plan states that Affordable housing includes: -social rented-owned and managed by a Local Authority (LA) or a registered provider (RP) for which the target rents are determined through the national rent regime or other providers where there are equivalent rental arrangements agreed with the LA or the HCA; - Affordable Rented-Homes let by an RP to householders eligible for social rented housing at a rent level no more than 80% of the local market rent. Intermediate- houses at prices or rents above social rent levels but below market price or rents and which meet the needs of eligible households, including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford with regard to local incomes and local house prices. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 590131 | | RESIDENT | LP201582 | The old formula was jobs followed by housing. To allow housing to expand and hope jobs will follow is a dodgy proposition. If people can afford to buy houses and pay the upkeep all good and well, but expecting the tax-payer to pick the bill up is heading for trouble. Once the blue areas are fully utilised build the houses, at the minute lots of units and land have stood empty for years. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The requirements for growth are informed by clear evidence of forecast job and population growth. The Local Plan sets out a plan for the homes that are required as a result of the anticipated job growth - whilst also responding to the boroughs aging population. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 792504 | | | LP2015139 | Too many new houses - this will put increasing pressure on existing overstretched services and road networks. Great Lime Road and Whitley Road in particular are already badly congested at peak times. Do not believe the numbers quoted by the Council on homes | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | | needed. Too many houses proposed. | | | meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | |
| 890535 | | | LP2015152 | When walking around Shiremoor all you see are to let signs and empty houses. Is there really a need for more housing or is this just another expensive exercise to satisfy the shortage of housing in the South East. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 792504 | | | LP2015153 | Whilst we recognise a need for some additional housing within the Borough, we feel that the loss of acres of open space to accommodate large new developments is excessive and that they should be significantly reduced. We feel that the population growth figures produced by the Council are not realistic and the total urbanisation of the Borough as proposed will significantly reduce the quality of life of many residents. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Comments noted. The plan aims to balance the environmental, social and economic demands of the borough. Green Infrastructure, biodiversity and green space provision policies are included to ensure such interests are given due consideration in the planning | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 890843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015157 | Strongly support brownfield development. Disapprove of greenfield development. Fail to understand how we can both have any greenfield development and "keep open areas at 20%." | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|--|
| 890859 | | RESIDENT | LP2015174 | I understand the need for new housing and I feel that North Tyneside has done well to minimise the number of new houses and to protect the environment. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Support noted. This figure is supported by the latest evidence of need. Further detail is outlined in the NT Population and Household Forecasts, available to read on the Council website. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 890912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015181 | I am in full support of the housing development. It is important for the economic success of our region. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Support for proposed housing requirement noted. This figure is supported by the latest evidence of need. Further detail is outlined in the NT Population and Household Forecasts, available to read on the Council website. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 805135 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP2015198 | cannot be seen in its entirety. It doesn't print out either (on my machine. Would it be possible to send me a separate copy please? | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Request for additional information noted. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 891663 | | RESIDENT | LP2015199 | You are taking all of what is left of the countryside around the immediate area, use brownfield, not greenfield sites. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 891827 | | RESIDENT | LP2015202 | I cannot see why you need to build approximately 17,500 new homes, it's like there's a field lets build on it. I do not like that. You want to build beside the Rising Sun Country Park. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | |
| 891835 | | RESIDENT | LP2015212 | Five Mile Park looks very good in this area (Seaton Burn, Wideopen). All seems reasonable. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Comment noted. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 468309 | | RESIDENT | LP2015237 | I think employment will grow larger than indicated, but the prediction for housing appears reasonable. However I am aware that our young population is vastly short of 1-bedroomed accommodation - are such flats to be built? | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Comments noted. The Local Plan sets out that new development should have regard to evidence for housing types and size - primarily from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. This includes identification of needs for one bedroom homes. Some provision for such housing is expected over the plan period. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 892200 | | RESIDENT | LP2015251 | 5,000 more homes, when will this end, building everywhere. There will be nowhere to go for a nice country walk in years to come. Government needs to look at lowering the population. Simple, stop building houses. Try and lower the population. Too many people!! | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. Not making adequate provision for new homes within North Tyneside will simply make it harder for residents to find quality homes to live in which they can afford. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 804904 | | | LP2015255 | Please provide a breakdown of [such fictitious forecast by] ethnicity and expected employment rate of the incoming masses. I would also be intrigued to see the algorithms such a report is based on | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Details of the housing and population forecasts are available within the evidence base schedule on the Council's planning portal website . The ethnicity of any current or future resident of North Tyneside is irrelevant. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| 892757 | | | LP2015283 | I dispute the figures stated for housing and the subsequent employment gains. The new development at Wellfield, comprising of 4 and 5 bedroom houses only, is representative of the council's disregard for and a contradiction of its own policy stating that smaller homes are required in the future. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 892836 | | RESIDENT | LP2015293 | The Local Plan Consultation 2015 is not evidence of the need for employment and new homes. North Tyneside is already well populated. Bringing more employment does not mean new homes. Restrict the new employment to a level which can be accommodated by residents of North Tyneside "" we do not need to bring more people here. Urbanisation is currently as a maximum level. Bringing in more people will mean more schools, traffic congestion. Stay where we are now. A further 10,200 homes means about 30,000 more residents, we do not want such a growth in population, it could mean up to 15/20,000 new cars on the roads. We cannot cope now. Challenge the Government about their requirements, reconsider the evidence. I like living in North Tyneside - please don't force me to move away because of unrealistic policies - both local and national. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 467684 | | RESIDENT | LP2015319 | I do not accept that so many houses are needed. If you must have them, convert the white elephant empty office blocks at West Allotment into flats but heaven help the traffic congestion. I am surprised Labour Council is so willing to accede to Tory | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | Government's call for more housing - it suggests this Council is more than willing to punish the coast for not voting for them. This is not the way to get more votes. | | | meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | |
| 893274 | | RESIDENT | LP2015325 | How accurate is the forecasting for such a commitment for growth and job opportunities. If the intention is to continue for North Tyneside to be a great place to live, work and visit then it must address the present deficiencies that exist in areas where pavements are uneven, roads are in a poor state of maintenance and parking regulations are not being enforced. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 893355 | | RESIDENT | LP2015329 | I have viewed the Local Plan at meetings and the document posted through my door. I understand the reason for this. I hope for a mixture of housing for local people as we all want something nice to live in and bring our family up in. I know you can't please everyone. North Tyneside Council are the best people to do this as they have the history and concern for the residents of North Tyneside. Where others' concerns are money making and profit nothing else. We can't let them in. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 794139 | | RESIDENT | LP2015349 | There is no justification or evidence in any growth forecast of North Tyneside's population for the vast numbers of houses planned. The demand from local people will not exceed 1,500. Environmentally it will be catastrophic. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 675953 | | RESIDENT | LP2015356 | I think that despite the efforts of the Council, we are in danger of creating a sprawling, polluted and grid locked borough which will | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | | be much less attractive to live in. The emptiest county in the country is Northumberland and it could easily accommodate another large new town which could take any overspill from North Tyneside, if indeed so many new houses are really necessary, a fact that I am far from convinced of. Whilst some limited development could take place without altering significantly the nature of the Borough, the present plans contain far too many houses. Many communities are in danger of losing their individual identities. | | | development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. The Local Plan seeks to identify the most sustainable brownfield and greenfield sites for development and sets out a range of policy to deliver the infrastructure the borough needs and protect North Tynesides character, environment and attractiveness. Without working to plan for the needs of the borough growth is likely to take place anyway in an ad hoc manner and not secure required benefits for the borough. | with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 396930 | | RESIDENT | LP2015407 | There is sufficient level of unemployment in this area to satisfy your stated demand for about 13,000 new jobs, without any further house building. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 893913 | | | LP2015418 | It appears that the council grants planning permission to allow house building where there is NO demand. Where are the JOBS that these people will need to occupy these houses! | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 444906 | | RESIDENT | LP2015431 | I support the growth, which is inevitable, as long as the growth is supported by | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough | The objectively assessed housing requirement has |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | infrastructure development - roads, road junctions, schools, local shops etc. | | | Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 894718 | | RESIDENT | LP2015438 | Keep population down - as not enough jobs for the people who work here now - too many people and cars. Then reassess later. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 894746 | | RESIDENT | LP2015447 | Keeping housing numbers down and population as not enough jobs for women and leisure and tourism and culture. Too many cars and too many people, less houses, not enough jobs! Better balance please! | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 894903 | | RESIDENT | LP2015453 | I agree absolutely that new houses are needed. It is crucial that a proportion are "affordable" - especially for first time buyers and those on low incomes. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Support noted. Policy 4.7 aims for a Borough-wide target for at least 25% of all new homes to be affordable. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015473 | Further to our response to the first version of the North Tyneside Local Plan in late 2013, and in accordance with the duty to co-operate and cross-boundary joint working in terms of potential requirements to additionally provide for some of the development needs of | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | neighbouring authorities where reasonable and appropriate, we understand that with Newcastle and Northumberland helping to provide for some of your objectively assessed needs in seeking to re-balance the north of Tyne area's cross-boundary housing market, there is no requirement for South Tyneside to potentially help provide for any of North Tyneside's housing needs. We would nevertheless be interested to know whether you consider that the district may have any additional capacity (primarily in non-Green Belt areas) that could potentially help provide for any of South Tyneside's identified development needs should that come to be necessary? While we recognise that South Tyneside is considered to be a largely self-contained housing market area, there is inevitably some degree of cross-boundary movements within the wider economic market (travel-to-work) area that, coupled with evidence of migration patterns, might suggest reasonable scope for a small proportion of South Tyneside's development needs being provided for within the North Tyneside area. We would be happy to discuss this matter further as part of the ongoing cross-authorities dialogue. | | | meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. North Tyneside's growth forecasts take into account a range of scenarios for growth. Through the North Tyneside SHMA only a limited relationship is identified between North Tyneside and South Tyneside's housing markets. At this time, North Tyneside's strategy indicates that the level of housing growth will be outstripped by job growth whilst. Meanwhile, ongoing improvements to connectivity along the A19 between North and South Tyneside may over the plan period increase connectivity between the two authorities. Both Newcastle and Northumberland are looking to increase their rates of housing delivery to retain levels of working age population. Considerations of the potential rates of migration between North and South Tyneside would need to be considered within that wider sub-regional context and North Tyneside will be happy to continue working with South Tyneside on overall strategies for housing delivery. | |
| 806166 | | RESIDENT | LP2015475 | I am writing to object strongly to the North Tyneside Local Plan for the following reasons: "ç The plan is based on growth rates which are overly-ambitious even though earlier consultation showed that people in North Tyneside wanted to aim for lower rate of growth in order to save valued green spaces. The ceding of population to | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | NewcastleGateshead is not adequately reflected in the growth figures. I would like to see the Council aim for a more realistic growth rate which would reduce the amount of greenfields that will be built on and which will make the protection and enhancement of coherent ecological networks more achievable. | | | homes and employment opportunities. | |
| 801358 | | RESIDENT | LP2015486 | We need to stop immigration, not build more housing. You need to consider who pays your exorbitant salaries. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 895187 | | | LP2015509 | I find the current concept on the total number of homes needed does not reflect the reality on the ground as certainly the new homes at Monkseaton Sainsbury's area are not selling/building at any fast rate (Pricing the most obvious reason) while the development at Earsdon Grange (Shiremoor) has hardly gone at a rapid rate and the open area's already approved look likely to last for a good few years. Most basically as well, should all the space in North Tyneside be filled with housing as this plan would imply, the Wild life corridors are a joke if major roads go through the middle of them. Therefore the housing being built currently and no doubts in the future is not what is required but is more what the builders can charge premium prices for. It is also noticeable that a large number of brown field sites along the river bank are for | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | employment usage, there is no proof will ever appear so should be allocated to housing leaving current open space untouched. | | | | |
| 895338 | | RESIDENT | LP2015521 | The figures for the number of new homes (and the assumed new inhabitants of these) seems far greater than the number of new jobs. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 895340 | | RESIDENT | LP2015525 | 1) Growth Forecast Prediction is very difficult, especially about the future. (Niels Bohr) "ç The need to develop Murton and Killingworth Moor is heavily dependent on the housing need identified in the forecast. "ç It takes considerable time before confidence in identifiable trends can be established and become actionable. "ç There must be more than usual uncertainty in the economic growth assumptions made at the time of the study (c 2014). o Agglomeration of London and the South East o The rise of Manchester as the centre for a new northern powerhouse (and not the NE) o The new norm of low growth due to QE and the irrecoverable economic loss from the financial crisis o UKIP success stops EU immigration o Expansion of the Metro network will take pressure off North Tyneside to the economic benefit of neighbouring local authorities o The demographics of Generations Y and Z being unable to accumulate sufficient wealth to own homes may cause a conceptual readjustment by society "ç If first home house | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | prices are a proxy for housing demand, then unlike these, overall house prices and hence demand has remained flat for over a decade. Where is this housing need? "ç In our view, the forecast still looks decidedly optimistic and it would be wrong to be shackled to these estimates "ç The Planning Dept carries out annual review of major plans however these will all be predicated on the 2014 study forecast. Given the above uncertainties, this may lead to premature development of the last remaining greenfield sites. "ç Remember growth does not continue indefinitely. No tree ever grows to heaven! ACTION: Fresh growth forecasts are commissioned at 5 or 7 yearly intervals and the pace of release of land within existing development plans adjusted accordingly. | | | | |
| 895341 | | RESIDENT | LP2015531 | 1) Growth Forecast Prediction is very difficult, especially about the future. (Niels Bohr) "ç The need to develop Murton and Killingworth Moor is heavily dependent on the housing need identified in the forecast. "ç It takes considerable time before confidence in identifiable trends can be established and become actionable. "ç There must be more than usual uncertainty in the economic growth assumptions made at the time of the study (c 2014). o Agglomeration of London and the South East o The rise of Manchester as the centre for a new northern powerhouse (and not the NE) o The new norm of low growth due to QE and the irrecoverable economic loss from the financial crisis o UKIP success stops EU immigration o Expansion of the Metro network will take pressure off | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | North Tyneside to the economic benefit of neighbouring local authorities o The demographics of Generations Y and Z being unable to accumulate sufficient wealth to own homes may cause a conceptual readjustment by society "ç If first home house prices are a proxy for housing demand, then unlike these, overall house prices and hence demand has remained flat for over a decade. Where is this housing need? "ç In our view, the forecast still looks decidedly optimistic and it would be wrong to be shackled to these estimates "ç The Planning Dept carries out annual review of major plans however these will all be predicated on the 2014 study forecast. Given the above uncertainties, this may lead to premature development of the last remaining greenfield sites. "ç Remember growth does not continue indefinitely. No tree ever grows to heaven! ACTION: Fresh growth forecasts are commissioned at 5 or 7 yearly intervals and the pace of release of land within existing development plans adjusted accordingly. | | | | |
| 519118 | | RESIDENT | LP2015558 | I strongly oppose to the building of so many new houses in the borough of North Tyneside. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 457843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015562 | No building - preserve some green. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 897295 | | RESIDENT | LP2015599 | The plan is based on growth rates which are overly-ambitious even though earlier consultation showed that people in North Tyneside wanted to aim for lower rate of growth in order to save valued green spaces. The ceding of population to NewcastleGateshead is not adequately reflected in the growth figures. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 897298 | | RESIDENT | LP2015609 | Your also states you have strong evidence of forecast growth prepared by independent experts but fails to say who they are and who and when they consulted with the people of the area. Can I have this information also please? | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 897599 | | RESIDENT | LP2015631 | The residents of North Tyneside have consistently made clear that we object to further development on greenfield sites, including Green Belt, Wildlife Corridors and other open spaces. Your predictions of growth rates are out-of-date and your statement that household sizes are getting smaller does not match reality. My wife and I both work in housing and properties in the borough are increasingly difficult-to-let, often requiring double-figure viewings before a successful allocation. The dreaded "bedroom tax"™ | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | has played its part in keeping families together and in re-forming other families. | | | | |
| 897784 | | RESIDENT | LP2015670 | "Chicken and egg situation" - creation of new jobs taken up by people already living in the area or houses built but bought by people who already have enough income to buy. People seem to drive ever increasing distances to work. Whether building for employment or housing all areas highlighted seem to suggest future traffic problems. Having to provide a Local Plan "by law" is a decision made by the situation in the South of England where we know there is a real housing problem - the north's housing issues are quite different. The reviews used to determine jobs/homes numbers is speculative?? | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 897599 | | RESIDENT | LP2015684 | We both work in housing, where properties of all sizes are increasingly difficult-to-let. Your predictions are flawed and don't appear to be based on any concrete evidence. We urge the Council to re-assess growth figures and to do more to protect our remaining open spaces. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 803337 | | RESIDENT | LP2015687 | Overall the option you have taken is a happy medium for the population of North Tyneside and hopefully the dictate of the government. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Support noted. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP2015706 | Builders have planning permission for 5,000 + houses in North Tyneside at the present time. The NTC Local Plan housing section 7.36 shows a graph that estimates the present outstanding planning permissions will not be | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | used up until 2026. | | | order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | |
| 898159 | | RESIDENT | LP2015707 | Are an extra 10,200 homes in our borough really necessary? | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 898208 | | RESIDENT | LP2015713 | The plan is based on growth rates which are overly-ambitious. The previous consultation showed that people in North Tyneside wanted a lower rate of growth in order to save valued green spaces and wildlife. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 898230 | | RESIDENT | LP2015730 | The plan is based on growth rates which are overly-ambitious. The previous consultation showed that people in North Tyneside wanted a lower rate of growth in order to save valued green spaces and wildlife. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 898375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015759 | The plan is based on growth rates which are overly-ambitious. The previous consultation showed that people in North Tyneside wanted a lower rate of growth in order to save valued green spaces and wildlife. The ceding of | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | population to Newcastle-Gateshead is not adequately reflected in the growth figures. | | | order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | |
| 791057 | | RESIDENT | LP2015772 | Look after other residents or you will lose them to other Boroughs. I oppose strongly the plans in general principally because there is no evidence to sustain this level of housing with employment. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015775 | I also agree with the figures for new homes however I feel very strongly that as many of these new homes as possible should be North Tyneside Council homes. Over the last 30 years so many council tenants took their right to buy yet the council did not use that money to build more homes for rent and they now have a shortage crisis, we need more rental property rather than private developments! | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 468254 | | RESIDENT | LP2015805 | The projections for housing need are based on greatly exaggerated forecasts for population growth. Similar exaggerated forecasts are being made in both Durham and Northumberland, hence the government rejection of the plans in County Durham. This should prompt a thorough re-evaluation of housing needs, using the lowest forecast which is available to you. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 898560 | | RESIDENT | LP2015829 | The new homes are badly needed. It's unrealistic to think growth can be achieved by using only brownfield land. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Comment noted. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| 898591 | | RESIDENT | LP2015848 | Where is the demand for the vast number of proposed houses coming from given the number of unsold properties in the area? (currently Rightmove is showing 1000+ within a 5 miles radius of Shiremoor). | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 467822 | | RESIDENT | LP2015879 | Agree that we need to: a) plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes b) Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for householder growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes. c) Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth. 2) To meet our requirements for employment growth to 2030, do you agree that the council should plan to provide 170 hectares of land for development- No. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 804904 | | | LP2015909 | Is this trip advisor, am I seriously seeing other comments from residents suggesting that this is a good idea? | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Comments noted. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 898848 | | RESIDENT | LP2015948 | Over the last 10 years I've seen massive housing development in the local area. This has mainly been to the detriment of green sites (so much for protecting them). I think we've now reached saturation point. When is enough, enough. It seems locals have no rights, quality of life or more development. When will this madness stop. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| 899067 | | | LP20151038 | <p>I strongly disagree with your projections for the need for land for new houses. Another commenter has noted that the present planning permission for 5,000 + houses in North Tyneside at the present time. will not be used up until 2026. You need to take into account unsold and empty properties in your equations, for example, how many unsold and empty properties does the borough have that could contribute to the housing need? Build 'up' near transport links, not 'out' far from transport links. I note most sites are brownfield, and I welcome that, but please remove the greenfield sites or put them in reserve on a secondary tranche until all of the brownfield sites are used. Building on greenfield sites with poor transport links is not sustainable development. Consider the visual impact of developments " build a village first not a vast ghetto housing estate where detached houses are separated by the width of a wheelie bin. I repeat what I've said in previous sections in case it is missed here: The population in North Tyneside in 1981 was 198,700, so there has been a very low increase in population (by your measure 2300 people in 34 years). The lowest population figure of 190,500 was in 1997, and the increase between then and now (18 years) is 10,700. The ONS projects an increase of nearly DOUBLE this figure over a slightly less period of time, which is optimistic given the previous trends. The ONS also uses the phrase 'if current trends continue' so these projections are not a given as has been quoted back to me. Yet, you are planning for</p> | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>23,000 more people in the borough in 17 years. Far from using the middling ground I think these figures are overly optimistic and I do not think you should be planning on an "if current trends continue" scenario from an external body. You make no mention of sensitivity analysis in these figures. I would hope that you have performed some as this would help inform the point about prioritising development on brownfield sites and monitoring its development. Furthermore, what is the demographic of the 23,000 people you expect to live in the borough? This will significantly affect the type of housing required. For example, the population of the over 65s increased by 14% between 1981 and 2010, and the family population "those from 0 to 49 - has decreased by 9.5% over the same period. This means that different housing stock is required to the 2, 3, 4 bedroom "executive" houses currently being built. In addition to this point, older people live in their large houses because they want to be near their friends of 30, 40, or 50 years. If appropriate housing was built for them, that would free up larger housing stock, without the need to build on precious green fields. It is my understanding that there is a surplus of school places in North Tyneside and that the new schools are just rebuilds of existing ones - if that is the case, then where are all the school places required for such a massive increase in population coming from? In addition, where are all the health facilities coming from? The lower end of the spectrum for housing need would seem more</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | appropriate and would be easily defensible to the Department for Communities and Local Government. Save valued green and wildlife space please. | | | | |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151098 | Green Party These figures are based on a Growth Option which was rejected by local residents as indicated by the Consultation November 2013 quoted above. They are based on a population increase projection of some 23,000 over the next 15 years a 12% increase, which is quite substantial. The lower growth option preferred by local residents in the consultation indicated a more reasonable increase in population of 12,000, a 6% increase. The infrastructure and roads which will be needed to support the proposed increase in population will inevitably have a detrimental impact on the environment in terms of use of greenfield land and existing roads and facilities. It will also increase substantially the amount of carbon emissions through car ownership and traffic congestion. This development is not sustainable in terms of the Vision in the introduction to the Plan: "Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves don't mean worse lives for future generations. " It will inevitably have a detrimental impact in terms of the Objectives cited above in relation to protecting and enhancing the natural environment, reducing carbon emissions etc. Also, planning permission has already been granted for a large number of housing developments in the borough (4,800 homes) most of which have not yet been started e.g. Smiths Docks. This indicates that the housing | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>developers are not anxious to build, presumably because they think they won't be able to sell the houses. In practice of course the more houses that are built on the borough's Greenfield sites the less attractive it becomes as an area to live in. The open space is valued by residents; once gone there is less incentive to live here. We support a Local Plan based on Growth Option C 7.25 Based on baseline growth in jobs to 2032 "" Lower than the Borough's starting point set out in national population projections. This option results in a need for 562 homes per year and 11,808 from 2011 to 2032. Estimated 6,081 homes to plan for. Low Growth "" 912 homes per year, 2x long term average and 374 jobs. The difference between housing needs between Options B and C is about 5,000 houses. This number is much more sustainable and will not require such large scale developments at Killingworth Moor and Murton. Instead some of this land can be used for food production/market gardening as suggested above. It is worth noting that even this level of house building represents "2 x long term average" . Even this will be a hard target to meet, let alone the higher targets, even if they were desirable!</p> | | | | |
| 898981 | | | LP20151118 | <p>Since the growth projections are forecasts and will never be expected to be 100% accurate over a 15 year period, the council should follow a "first do no harm" approach. I would approach this as follows Firstly, use up the existing housing permissions. According to the figures there are just under 5000 approved, so this should survive 5 years of the</p> | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | <p>The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new</p> | <p>The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | current projections. In year 3 of those projections, if growth figures are still following the same trajectory, then pick the least environmentally sensitive brownfield sites (or those requiring the most remediation) and grant those planning permission. Aim for enough homes for another 5 years. 3 years into that 5 year "chunk" review the growth figures again and repeat. Only once all brownfield sites are developed should green field land even be considered. It should certainly not be granted planning permission based on 15 year forecasts given the degree of statistical error possible in those timescales. | | | homes and employment opportunities. | |
| 805471 | | | LP20151124 | I agree with those that state that your figures are not rational. You state houses will be built in their hundreds over the period however properties under development are already struggling to be sold. In addition there appear to be over 1000 properties for sale and over 1200 available to rent and that was just a cursory count today. There does not appear to be an exponential growth in industry /retail/ administrative business in the area to warrant such growth. 15200 homes equate to over 30000 people moving into the area and no one moving out. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 797386 | | | LP20151130 | You need to think through the whole proposed housing policy again. The population of NT is not growing by much - one cannot use the national figures, which are massively skewed by the southeast, to predict growth in the northeast. People from overseas do not want to come and live here and there is no need to attract them to assist | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | with labour (as for example they have to do in East Anglia). There is no need for much more private housing - property prices are static here and rentals take some time to be taken up, which strongly indicates that there is enough private housing. And you have countless comments from local residents to the effect that they do not want more housing. The lifestyle of local residents is surely (or should be) very important to the Council - unnecessary housing, with its knock-on effect on traffic, schools, green areas and other amenities, will have an adverse effect on the lives of residents. There is probably a need for more affordable housing. There are many brownfield sites, empty flats above shops, areas on the outskirts of the shopping areas etc which should be used first. Of course it is more onerous for a developer to build on a brownfield site than a green one - but the role of the Council should be to protect our area for the residents and thus not take the easy route of selling off green plots. In short, don't turn NT into yet another area blighted by too much housing, too many people, too much traffic etc. Preserve the good balance that we currently have. | | | homes and employment opportunities. | |
| 899309 | | | LP20151150 | The scenario in which this demand for new homes is based predicts a 1% increase in population growth rate indicated in Table 6, from the current population of 15-64 yo (considered working age group) 132, 276 in 2011 to 133, 601 in 2032. How does this marginal increase in population spread over a 20-yr period justify the need for 10, 200 new homes? The problem of giving planning | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>permission NOW for what we believe is the requirement of the future is that we deny the future generation to decide on what they want for themselves and their environment, or whatever is left of it by the time they can make the decisions. The word Sustainability is thrown around in the Plan as if the council really understands what it means, the United Nations define sustainability as providing 'decent standard of living for everyone today without compromising the needs of future generation.' How is it socially and environmentally sustainable to convert greenfields into concrete blocks? We understand the need to chase progress but it is unfortunately measured solely in monetary terms. It is difficult to place value on open spaces and the sense of well being experienced by people who benefit from these. The proposal to build a housing estate so close to Rising Sun Country Park is a lazy solution and should be rejected. Already we have witnessed an unprecedented number of new housing development around Forest Hall, Killingworth and Benton in less than five years. The environment, natural and built, can only take so much stress, we now experience flooding in areas which didn't have flooding previously, the education and health facilities in the area are deteriorating, traffic is getting worse, these are the price we and our children have to pay in our pursuit of unmediated progress.</p> | | | | |
| 805554 | | | LP20151225 | <p>This is a huge over estimation of new homes required and the council should provide robust evidence of how this number is</p> | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | <p>The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for</p> | <p>The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | considered realistic. Why does around 10% of the new housing stock have to come from one area of the borough between Wallsend and Benton? The impact of the plan is totally disproportionate in a negative way to residents of those areas having seen the site to the north east of station road sacrificed by the council's failure to have had a plan in place before that application was called in!! | | | development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 898630 | | | LP20151272 | I disagree with your projections for the need for land for new houses. Another commenter has noted that the present planning permission for 5,000 + houses in North Tyneside at the present time. will not be used up until 2026. You need to take into account unsold and empty properties in your equations "" how many unsold and empty properties does the borough have that could contribute to the housing need? Build ""up' near transport links and jobs, not ""out' far from transport links and jobs I note most sites are brownfield, and I welcome that, but please remove the greenfield sites or put them in reserve on a secondary tranche until all of the brownfield sites are used. Building on greenfield sites with poor transport links is not sustainable development. The riverside, if it is to have a thriving manufacturing base, would be ideal for housing and links north south, and into Newcastle and the coast on the metro. Consider the visual impact of developments "" build a village first not a vast ghetto housing estate where detached houses are separated by the width of a wheelie bin. In addition, you have added sites 111 and 139 since the last , yet sites 16, 18, 83, the land | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>opposite Station Road near Darsley Park, a site at Palmersville, and four in Killingworth now have planning permission or are already built. I think this area has had enough development. I repeat what I've said in previous sections in case it is missed here: The population in North Tyneside in 1981 was 198,700, so there has been a very low increase in population (by your measure 2300 people in 34 years). The lowest population figure of 190,500 was in 1997, and the increase between then and now (18 years) is 10,700. The ONS projects an increase of nearly DOUBLE this figure over a slightly less period of time (21,000 over 17 years), which is optimistic given the previous trends. The ONS also uses the phrase "if current trends continue' so these projections are not a given as has been quoted back to me . Yet, you are planning for 23,000 more people in the borough in 17 years. Far from using the middling ground I think these figures are overly optimistic and I do not think you should be planning on an "if current trends continue' scenario from an external body. You make no mention of sensitivity analysis in these figures. I would hope that you have performed some as this would help inform the point about prioritising development on brownfield sites. In addition, the sites granted planning permission since the consultation in 2013 should count towards the housing figure but you haven't reflected that. Furthermore, what is the demographic of the 23,000 people you expect to live in the borough? This will significantly affect the type of housing</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | required. For example, the population of the over 65s increased by 14% between 1981 and 2010, and the family population " those from 0 to 49 - has decreased by 9.5% over the same period. This means that different housing stock is required to the 2, 3, 4 bedroom houses currently being built. In addition to this point, older people live in their large houses because they want to be near their friends of 30, 40, or 50 years. If appropriate housing was built for them, that would free up larger housing stock, without the need to build on precious green fields. It is my understanding that there is a surplus of school places in North Tyneside and that the new schools are just rebuilds of existing ones - if that is the case, then where are all the school places required for such a massive increase in population coming from? In addition, where are all the health facilities coming from? Save valued green and wildlife space please. The lower end of the spectrum for housing need would seem more appropriate and would be easily defensible to the Department for Communities and Local Government. | | | | |
| 899455 | | | LP20151282 | The population and housing projections are too high and you should develop on brownfield sites first before allocating greenfield sites to housing. Please remove sites 17,111 and 139 from allocation for housing and build near the riverside or regenerate the north west of the borough. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 899459 | | | LP20151288 | These figures are based on a Growth Option which was rejected by local residents as | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough | The objectively assessed housing requirement has |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | indicated by the Consultation November 2013. They are based on a population increase projection of some 23,000 over the next 15 years "" a 12% increase, which is quite substantial. The lower growth option "" preferred by local residents in the consultation "" indicated a more reasonable increase in population of 12,000, a 6% increase. | | | Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 899469 | | | LP20151295 | These figures are based on a Growth Option which was rejected by local residents as indicated by the Consultation November 2013 quoted above. They are based on a population increase projection of some 23,000 over the next 15 years "" a 12% increase, which is quite substantial. The lower growth option "" preferred by local residents in the consultation "" indicated a more reasonable increase in population of 12,000, a 6% increase. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151305 | S7.2 "" Housing The proposed housing target of the development of 16,632 new homes over the period from 2011/12 to 2031/32 at an annual average of 792 new homes per year is broadly supported on the basis of information available at the date of publication. However, the proposed housing figures will need to be updated to take account of revised DCLG Household Projections released 27 February 2015. This data provides the starting point for estimating the overall housing need for the plan area. The 2012-based projections continue to reflect recessionary trends in household formation as per the interim 2011 based household projections; however the revised | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>data indicates that for North Tyneside the average household size is likely to decrease at an increased rate over that previously predicted, thus resulting in an increased household growth which will need to be met by a corresponding increase in the delivery of new homes. Initial assessments indicate the difference between the 2011 based households per annum and the 2012 based households per annum over the initial ten years of the plan 2011-2021 (comparisons beyond 2011 are not possible due to the extent of 2011 data) are an additional 61 dwellings per annum . Further work is necessary to correctly reflect the most up-to-date data in the assessment of the plan areas OANs and this should inform the next iteration of the plan. 7.13 makes reference to the SHLAA and the technical assessment of sites to meet the Borough's housing development. There are a number of sites within the SHLAA where the Council's assessment of deliverability is questioned as being over optimistic including the estimated annual delivery figures for example Smith's Dock commencing in 2015/16 with a delivery rate of 80 units per year. This also therefore questions the accuracy of the Council's Five Year Housing Land Supply position and the Housing trajectory (see response to 7.29). (7.29) Suggests that "overall North Tyneside has successfully delivered housing targets and does not have a history of underperformance'; this is not borne out by the evidence provided in the SHLAA 2014 table 8. This clearly indicates that over a 10</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>year period from 2004/05 net housing delivery has not been met for the last six years; as a consequence North Tyneside has failed to deliver the housing target over this period by 455 units. If this assessment is restricted to a five year period from 2009/10 the net under delivery increases further to a deficit of 1415 units. Over the three years of the plan period from 2011/12 the deficit amounts to 1156 units. As the annual target has not been met more frequently than it has been met, and over the period there is a deficit of housing units, there is clearly a record of persistent under delivery NPPF (47) requiring a buffer of 20% to be applied. The Council's five year housing land supply document 2014-2019 forms an important evidence base for the Local Plan. The Council's methodology for the calculation of the five year housing land supply is questioned. It is suggested that the percentage buffer 5% or 20% should be applied to both the residual requirement and the identified shortfall/over provision in supply, rather than just the residual requirement. This method has been established through recent appeal cases (APP/H1840/A/13/2199085, APP/H1840/13/2199426 APP/V0728/A/13/2190009). A review of the Council's methodology is suggested to ensure that it complies with current best practice.</p> | | | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151345 | <p>Policy S7:2. Housing Figures. This represents 18.2% growth in the housing stock as at the 2011 census which seems disproportionate even to the 11% jobs growth that the NELEP Economic Strategy aspires to, even without</p> | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | <p>The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in</p> | <p>The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | taking into account the strategic policies for retaining new workforce in the Newcastle-Gateshead Plan. It is also about 4,700 higher than the housing provision (11,900) in the last iteration of the emerging North Tyneside Local Plan. Arguably the SNPP 2012-based figure of 15,971 (Table 3) is too high given the NG Plan policy. | | | order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | |
| 803900 | Northumb erland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151532 | The Council supports the reference to working closely with neighbouring authorities to ensure that planned housing growth across the three north of Tyne authorities is complementary. The Council would welcome the opportunity to continue to work together on population, housing and economic growth as part of the Duty to Cooperate discussions, to ensure that our finalised SHMAs and respective Local Plans recognise and reflect cross boundary relationships. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 898767 | | | LP20151545 | Our specific and strongly felt objections to the local plan are: There is not a heavy demand for more housing as evidenced by the sluggish housing market in the area. Destroying, for ever, the greenfield sites and wildlife corridors of the Benton area to meet an artificially hyped-up demand for new houses will utterly and irreversibly change the character of the area for no sound housing need. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 473231 | | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20151588 | The decision to pursue Growth Option B as stated at Paragraph 7.15 of the Plan is supported, as this is considered to be the most positive of the realistically achievable of the Growth Options. The previous consultation indicated that housing requirement could be reduced to between | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | 10,500 and 12,000, which would have resulted in a strategy of restricted growth. | | | future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | |
| 899194 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | | LP20151646 | NWL supports the removal of the references within the policy to reducing the housing requirement by working in partnership with Newcastle and Northumberland to provide any unmet need within North Tyneside. The housing requirement of 16,632 net additional dwellings between 2011/12 and 2031/2 or 792 dwellings per annum (dpa) represents a decrease upon the previous consultation which identified a requirement of 16,272 between 2013 and 2030 or 957dpa. NWL consider that to provide a positive statement and to be in accordance with the NPPF which sets out the need to 'boost significantly' housing supply, the housing requirement in the policy should be expressed as a minimum. NWL therefore recommend that the policy be reworded to "To provide for the growth and development needed in North Tyneside to meet the Borough's Objectively Assessed Need for new homes provision is made for the development of 16,632 homes from 2011/12 to 2031/32 at a minimum annual average of 792 new homes per year." | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151731 | 22. The housing requirement of 16,632 net additional dwellings between 2011/12 and 2031/2 or 792 dwellings per annum (dpa) represents a significant uplift from the now revoked RSS requirement and in this regard the HBF supports the Council. It is, however, also noted that it represents a decrease upon the previous consultation which identified a requirement of 16,272 between 2013 and 2030 or 957dpa, albeit the Council were | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>seeking to reduce this requirement through the DtC. 23. The HBF consider that to provide a positive statement and one in conformity with the NPPF, including the need to boost significantly housing supply, the requirement should be expressed as a minimum. The HBF also consider that the housing requirement is set too low and we therefore recommend a further uplift. Our reasons for coming to this conclusion are set out in the following paragraphs. Methodology 24. In determining the housing requirement the Council has undertaken a number of scenarios to identify what may constitute an objectively assessed housing need for the area. These scenarios are discussed in the 2014 SHMA. The forecasts provide analysis against the 2011 based and 2008 based CLG headship rates. The 2014 SHMA considers three main elements in the forecasting work, which are demographic led forecasts, migration led forecasts and jobs led forecasts. Each main element is then varied and subject to sensitivity testing to provide a suite of 15 different forecasts each of which are presented against the 2011 and 2008 based CLG headship rates together with an average. The HBF considers the overall methodology employed in determining and selecting the scenarios to be generally appropriate. 25. The outputs from the modelling work provide a wide range of forecasts ranging from 243dpa (Natural change, 2011 based headship rates) and 1,855dpa (Jobs-led High+, 2008 based headship rates). The chosen housing requirement of 792dpa sits towards the lower</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>end of the scenarios and does not conform to any single scenario. The 2014 SHMA breaks down the scenarios into three broad growth options low, medium and high (Table 4.4). The housing requirement represents the medium growth option which is a mid-point between three scenarios including the medium jobs-led scenario with assumed reductions in commuting patterns. Interestingly the analysis of the growth options does not consider the higher level jobs-led growth options (in excess of 1,000dpa), including the commuting ratio adjusted Jobs-led high+ scenario. Neither the plan nor the 2014 SHMA adequately explain why this scenario was not considered. The HBF consider that this scenario is also realistic and should have been used to inform the discussion upon an appropriate objectively assessed housing figure. 2012 based sub national household projections (2012 based SNHP) 26. Following the publication of the 2014 SHMA the 2012 based SNHP were released. The NPPG, as amended, is clear that these represent the most up to date estimate of future household growth and as such should be used as the starting point for determining household growth (ID 2a-016-20150227). Over the full projection period (2012 to 2037) an annual growth of 751dpa is identified for North Tyneside. If the plan period is considered (2011 to 2032) annual growth rates are expected to be higher at 774dpa. This is just 18dpa lower than the proposed housing requirement. 27. In determining whether the 2012 based SNHP</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>are appropriate it must be considered that these have been influenced by a period of deep recession. It is widely acknowledged that the effect of the recession is a propensity towards lower household growth. Therefore as the economy continues to improve it is likely that household formation rates will also increase. It is therefore likely that the current household projections could suppress actual future rate of household growth. In this regard the HBF consider the 2012 SNHP should be considered as an absolute minimum starting point with uplifts required to meet economic aspirations and market signals within individual housing market areas. Economic aspirations 28. The plan, paragraph 5.22, clearly identifies that it seeks to accommodate at least 707 additional jobs per annum. Yet the proposed housing requirement only provides for 654 jobs per annum. This is a mismatch of 53 jobs per annum or 1,113 over the period of the housing requirement (2011 to 2032). The HBF is unclear why such a mismatch exists within the plan particularly as this is contrary to the NPPF (paragraph 158) and NPPG (ID 2a-018-20140306). It is therefore recommended that the Council resolve this mismatch and provide the relevant uplift in the housing requirement. 29. The housing requirement is reducing by an assumption that commuting rates will decrease over the plan period. The HBF agrees that reductions in commuting rates can be achieved by policy interventions. The reduction must, however, be based upon robust evidence indicating how this will be</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>achieved. The 2014 North Tyneside Household and Demographic Forecasts paper identifies that the sensitivity analysis of the medium jobs led scenario (upon which the chosen requirement is based) assumes a reduction in the commuting ratio from a derived ratio of 1.15 to 1.05 between 2014 and 2023. The HBF recognised that there appears to have been a reduction in the commuting ratio between the 2001 and 2011 census. It does, however, remain unclear how much this reduction was influenced by the recession and therefore how likely it is that such a trend will continue into the future. Market Signals 30. The 2014 SHMA discusses market signals in paragraph 4.18 onwards. This is a fundamental element of determining the objectively assessed need for housing (NPPG ID 2a-019-20140306) and a worsening trend in any of these indicators will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers (NPPG ID 2a-020-20140306). The 2014 SHMA provides a cursory consideration of the signals and in paragraph 4.23 indicates that no adjustment is required. 31. The HBF consider that such a determination should also take account of a comparison with similar neighbouring authorities. In this regard it is notable that house prices in North Tyneside were higher than the neighbouring authorities of Newcastle and Northumberland and greater than the Tyne and Wear average (Figure 3.1; 2014 SHMA). In addition relative affordability is the second worst against lower and median quartile house prices, behind Newcastle and Northumberland respectively,</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>within the region (Table 3.1 & 3.2; 2014 SHMA). 32. It is also clear that the Council has failed to meet its housing requirement over since 2007/8. This has led to under-delivery, in such cases the NPPG advises; "If the historic rate of development shows that actual supply falls below planned supply, future supply should be increased to reflect the likelihood of under-delivery of a plan.' (ID 2a-019-20140306) 33. The HBF is therefore of the opinion that there is a justification to provide an uplift of the housing requirement based upon market signals. Affordable Homes 34. The NPPF 2014 SHMA clearly identifies a need for affordable homes identifying a net need for 490 affordable homes per annum. This represents almost 62% of the overall housing requirement, this is clearly unlikely to be feasible due to economic viability implications. The need for affordable housing has also increased since the previous SHMA update in 2011 which identified an annual need for 479 affordable dwellings. 35. The 2012-13 Annual Monitoring Report identifies affordable housing delivery in Table H12. During the period 2004/5 to 2012/13 a total of 747 affordable dwellings were provided or just 83 per annum. This is significantly below the overall requirement. In such cases the NPPG advises; "An increase in the total housing figures included in the local plan should be considered where it could help deliver the required number of affordable homes'. (ID 2a-029-20140306) 36. The HBF therefore considers that an uplift in the housing requirement can be justified by the</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>identified need for affordable housing. Conclusion 37. The HBF consider that the proposed housing requirement is too low and a moderate uplift is recommended. In determining the level of uplift required the Council should have regard to the issues raised above with regards to market signals, past levels of under-delivery, the need to align employment and housing strategies and to assist in delivering greater quantities of affordable housing. Paragraph 7.29 / Table 8 38. It is noted that the Council intend to use a 5% buffer for its five year housing land supply calculation as required by NPPF, paragraph 47. Whilst the HBF concur that over the period 2004/5 to 2007/8 the Council exceeded its target it has in recent years fallen considerably short, even when assessed against the now revoked RSS requirement. The 2014/15 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies that this shortfall, taking account of the proposed housing requirement amounts to 455 units and a failure to deliver against its targets since 2007/8. 39. Whilst it is recognised that much of the shortfall is due to the proposed uplift in the housing requirement the HBF considers this to constitute persistent under-delivery and as such a 20% buffer should be applied. 40. Table 8 provides an indication of the outstanding requirement for housing land supply. This includes all sites with planning permission and awaiting to grant subject to the signing of section 106 agreements at 31st December 2014. Whilst the HBF does not dispute the figure we strongly recommend</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | that caution is utilised in using such figures when determining the remaining quantity of housing land to be allocated. This is because, due to numerous reasons, not all sites with planning permissions will be developed. The HBF therefore consider that a more robust calculation would be to apply a discount to the sites with planning permission or awaiting Section 106 sign-off. A common approach which has been accepted at a number of planning appeals is to provide a 10% deduction in unimplemented housing permissions to take into account that some commitments may not come forward (see appeals at Rothley APP/X2410/A/13/2196928 and Honeybourne APP/H1840/A/12/2171339). | | | | |
| 808917 | BDW North East | LAND DEVELOPER | LP20151771 | The LPCD states that "planning officers from the 5 Tyne and Wear authorities, plus Northumberland County and Durham County, have met regularly throughout the formation of the Plan to share and respond to Cross Boundary issues" . There is also a Memorandum of Understanding in place, approved by North Tyneside Cabinet in 2013, which sets out the agreement between the 7 relevant authorities on how they can comply with their duty to cooperate. BDW is pleased with the cross-boundary work that has taken place. The examination of the LP will test whether the council has complied with the duty to cooperate. The NPPG highlights that in order to meet the duty to cooperate test the Local Authority "" will need to submit comprehensive and robust evidence of the efforts it has made to cooperate and any | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>outcomes achieved" (NPPG, para 003). BDW recognise that the council have identified the broad topics considered under the duty to cooperate. However, there needs to be clarification of the specific issues discussed. There is also no reference to the outcomes of the discussions and what was done to address the issues discussed. Without evidence of the cooperation and outcomes achieved the Inspector will find the LP unsound. The NPPG states that "it is unlikely that this (the duty) can be satisfied by consultation alone" and that "inspectors will assess the outcomes of the cooperation and not just whether LPAs have approached others" . BDW are pleased to see that the council has worked closely with Newcastle and Northumberland in considering its housing requirement. The SHMA recognises that "Newcastle proposes to reduce net migration losses, particularly of working age families to its neighbouring authorities, principally North Tyneside€ . It is consistent to see the North Tyneside plan replicate the agreement sought by Newcastle and Gateshead in their plan "" to reduce out-migration from Newcastle to North Tyneside. In terms of Northumberland "the Northumberland SHMA (December 2014) has included consideration of potential additional migration from North Tyneside, which reflects increased connectivity between the two areas in employment and housing and indicates that the County's preferred strategy could support the additional housing needs that could arise" . Northumberland stated that</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the two local authorities were going to produce a joint position statement on OAN, including member input and signoff. The LPCD and its supporting documents do not make any reference to this. BDW would welcome clarification from the council on whether Northumberland is taking a proportion of North Tyneside's additional housing needs, any number agreed and the impact on the housing requirement of each authority. To fulfil the duty to cooperate the council must make reference to the outcome of discussions and what was done to address the issues discussed. A statement must be produced demonstrating the cooperation between the council and Northumberland. It must outline any agreement that has been reached between the two councils, whether the council plan on transferring its surplus housing requirement to Northumberland, the numbers agreed and the impact upon the housing requirement of each authority. The council sets out its preferred housing requirement of 16,632 homes from 2011/12-2031/32. An annual average of 792 new homes per year. The RSS set out a target of 11,940 over 15 years. BDW are pleased to see that the overall housing requirement represents a significant uplift on the now revoked RSS requirement. However, the previous consultation set out an annual requirement of 957 dwellings per annum. Therefore the requirement of 792 new homes per year set out in the LPCD represents a decrease on the previous requirement set out by the council. The council must ensure the</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>housing requirement set is sufficiently aspirational. In accordance with the NPPG the council must use the household projections as a starting point to estimate the overall housing need. The household projection-based estimate of housing need should then be adjusted to reflect factors affecting local demography and household formation rates not captured in future trends. The council should adjust the need number to reflect appropriate market signals as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings "" land prices, house prices, rents, affordability, rate of development and overcrowding. The methodology used to calculate housing need by the council is appropriate. The council have forecast three scenarios against the 2011-based and 2008-based CLG headship rates: demographic led forecasts, migration led forecasts and jobs led forecasts. These were then subjected to sensitivity testing to provide 15 different forecasts. The NPPG states that councils must base their assessment on the most up-to-date household projections. The 2012-based household projections were released following the publication of the SHMA 2014. The council must review their housing need calculations in light of the new figures available. Looking at the 2012-based household projections they forecast an annual growth of 751 dwellings per annum in North Tyneside, over the full projection period 2012-2037. Considering the plan period, 2011 "" 2032 annual growth rates are expected to be</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>higher at 774 dwellings per annum. This is only 18 dwellings per annum less than the proposed housing requirement. The council needs to review their housing requirement based on the 2012-based SNHP, especially given that their proposed requirement is only 18 dwellings per annum more than the projections forecast. It is important that the council's requirement is more aspirational than the projections. The projections were influenced by a period of deep recession, the effect of which is a propensity towards lower household growth. As the economy improves housing formation rates are likely to increase, therefore 2012-based household projections could suppress actual future rates of household growth " concerning given that the councils proposed requirement is only 18 dwellings per annum higher. The council must review the housing requirement in light of the 2012-based household projections. These must be used as an absolute minim starting point. BDW have some concerns over the scenario chosen by the council. The housing requirement of 792 dwellings per annum is at the lower end of the scenarios. There are 9 scenarios which produce a higher target. BDW believe a higher target would be more appropriate. The analysis of the various growth options does not consider option 3 "Jobs led higher + (lower net out commute) SENS3, 1,350 homes per year. Neither the plan or the SHMA adequately explain why this scenario was not considered. This scenario is realistic and should be considered when discussing the housing figure. The</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>requirement of 792 dwellings per annum chosen as the preferred option by the council does not actually conform to any single scenario. It represents a mid-point between sub-national population projection 2012 (SNPP-2012) housing growth of 15,971 and 761 dwellings per annum and 10 year migration trend (PG 10-Yr) housing growth of 17,021 and 811 dwellings per annum. BDW also note that the medium growth option does not plan for sustainable population growth. It plans for a 6% in people aged 0-4 years, a 57% increase in people aged over 65 years, but only a 1% increase in the economically active population, aged 15-64 years. Whilst the higher growth option plans for a 5% increase in the economically active population. The council must plan for the growth of the borough, by planning for an increase in the economically active population, therefore the council should consider an uplift in the housing requirement. BDW urge the councils review the housing requirement based on 2012-based household projections as a minimum starting point. The council should consider higher scenarios and in particular "jobs led higher + (lower net out commute) SENS3 to take account of the need to plan for an increase in the economically active population. The housing requirement is reduced by an assumption that commuting rates will decrease over the plan period. The council must provide robust evidence of how a reduction in commuting rates would be achieved. BDW note that there has been a reduction in the commuting ratio between</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the 2001 and 2011 census. However, the council must remember this reduction was influenced by the recession. The council must provide robust evidence of how this reduction will continue into the future. The council must provide robust evidence to justify the reduction in commuting ratio, demonstrating how it would be achieved. Market signals and market indicators should be used to adjust the housing need number, as they give an indication of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. The NPPG, para 20 (Reference ID: 2a-019-20140306) states that "prices or rents rising faster than the national/local average may well indicate particular market undersupply relative to demand" . "The more significant the affordability constraints (as reflected in rising prices and rents, and worsening affordability ratio) and the stronger other indicators of high demand (e.g. the differential between land prices), the larger the improvement in affordability needed and, therefore, the larger the additional supply response should be" (NPPG, para 21 (Reference ID: 2a-021-20140306). BDW note that the council has undertaken a consideration of market signals in the borough and justified that there are no adjustments required. However, we believe the council should adjust the housing requirement in light of the boroughs higher house prices in comparison to Newcastle and Tyneside and the Tyne and Wear average. Relative affordability is also the second worst against lower and median quartile house</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>prices, between Newcastle and Northumberland respectively, within the region. The council must provide for an uplift in housing requirement to take account of the market signals with similar neighbouring authorities and the boroughs relative affordability. The RSS set out a target of 796 homes per year, 3,980 homes from 2008-2013. Net completions in this same 5 year period equalled 1,686 homes. A shortfall of 2,294 dwellings against the RSS requirement. The NPPG states that "if the historic rate of development shows that the actual supply fails below planned supply, future supply should be increased to reflect the likelihood of under-delivery of a planar€ (NPPG, para 20, Reference ID: 2a-019-20140306). The council must provide an uplift in housing requirement to take account of historic rates of under-delivery. The council must provide for an uplift in housing requirement to take account of the market signals with similar neighbouring authorities and the boroughs relative affordability. An uplift is also required to take account of historic rates of under-delivery. The council state that "it is also assumed that the 792 target addresses any backlog in demand as it uses a baseline figure based on the current demographic situation in North Tyneside€ . The council has failed to account for the undersupply. BDW notes that the council have included total additional homes delivered from 2011/12 "" 31 December 2014. Based on the annual requirement of 792 homes per annum this is a requirement of 2,376 homes. Therefore the</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>council has under-delivered by 743 units over the 3 years. The council must include this under-delivery in their outstanding gross housing target. In the two years prior to the start of this plan period the council delivered 947 homes, against a target of 1,592. This resulted in an undersupply of 645 homes. Therefore the total 5 year undersupply which must be included in the outstanding gross housing target is 1,388. In accordance with NPPF para 47 "where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land" . 20% should be added to the housing target and the undersupply to account for the council's persistent under delivery of housing. The outstanding gross housing target also includes a planning commitment of 4,810 units. However, the council has not made any allowance to provide any discount for non-implemented planning permissions. A 10% lapse rate would be reasonable, a practice which has been established through recent appeal decisions "" Rothley (APP/X2410/A/13/2196928) and Honeybourne (APP/H1840/A/12/2171339). BDW believe the outstanding housing requirement should be calculated as demonstrated below: Net housing target 2011/12 to 2031/32 16,632 Undersupply from 2009-2014 1,388 20% buffer applied to target and undersupply 3,604 Existing planning</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>permissions and sites minded to grant permission awaiting section 106 (as at 31 December 2014) minus 10% lapse rate 4,329 Outstanding Gross Housing target 2011/14 to 2031/32 17,295 The council should adjust the "outstanding gross housing target to take account of the undersupply, account for a 20% buffer and provide for a 10% lapse rate on planning commitments. BDW note that the councils proposed allocations provide sufficient capacity for 8,806 dwellings. This is 1,383 dwellings less than the council's outstanding gross housing target of 10,189. Against BDW's outstanding gross housing target the allocations produce a shortfall of 8,489 dwellings. The council must allocate more sites, consider releasing land from the Green Belt and re-designating safeguarded land as housing allocations/contingency land to meet the housing target. BDW note that the council have included a windfall allowance in their housing delivery calculation to meet the shortfall. The NPPF states that "local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five-year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a rely source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens" . The council must justify the inclusion of these windfall sites. They must provide compelling evidence that such sites have consistently</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. BDW note that the 2014/15 SHLAA identified that 356 windfalls came forward in the period 2009-14 at a rate of 45 dwellings per annum. This would still result in a shortfall of 573 units if windfall sites were to come forward at the same rate and deliver 810 dwellings over the plan period. The council must allocate more land for housing to meet its target. In accordance with the NPPG the council have produced an indicative trajectory of anticipated development, with consideration of associated risks to ensure consistency, accessibility and transparency. BDW have concern at the number of dwellings identified for year 1-5. The council has identified a supply of 735 homes per year for the first 5 years. This is 57 dwellings short of the 792 annual target. The number of dwellings identified for the first 5 years must be higher to meet the target. In accordance with the Sedgefield approach the council should meet the shortfall identified early in the plan period. The council should therefore account for this in its identification of sites, as well as including a 20% buffer. In accordance with the NPPF, the council should also produce a housing implementation strategy to sit alongside the housing trajectory. This should set out how the full range of housing will be implemented describing how they will maintain delivery of a 5-year supply of housing land (NPPF, para 14). To meet the housing target the council must allocate more sites, consider releasing land from the Green</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Belt and designate safeguarded land as housing allocations or contingency land. The council should also justify the inclusion of windfall sites. Five Year Land Supply The council must use the trajectory to demonstrate that they have a five-year land supply of deliverable housing sites.</p> <p>"Demonstration of a five year supply is a key material consideration when determining housing applications and appeals. As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, a five year supply is also central to demonstrating that relevant policies for the supply of housing are up-to-date in applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development" (NPPG, para 033, Ref ID: 3-033-20140306). The council should increase the number of dwellings identified in the first 5 years to meet the target, meet the shortfall identified early in the plan period and include a 20% buffer. BDW note that the council have calculated that North Tyneside has a 3.06 year housing land supply. BDW believe this is even lower at 2.05 years housing land supply. The main point is that the council does not currently have a 5 year land supply. A CDP requirement 2015-2020 3,960 B Shortfall 1,388 C 20% buffer as required by para 47 of the NPPF (applied to A+B) 3,604 D Revised 5-year housing requirement (A+B+C) 8,952 E 5-Year Annualised Average (D/5) 1,790 F Local Plan allocations and commitments total 3,675 G Difference (F-D) -5,277 J Number of Years Supply of Housing (F/E) 2.05 The NPPF states that "housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites" . The council must allocate more sites to ensure it can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and to ensure the housing target can be met. | | | | |
| 900308 | Places for People | | LP20151779 | (Comments with input from Urban Splash) There is an identified need to house an increased population of 21,000 by 2032, evidenced by SHMA growth forecasts. This translates to 792 homes per annum to meet Borough's Objectively Assessed Need from 211/12 to 2031/2032. The Smith's Dock development represents a significant contribution towards housing need in North Tyneside. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151797 | Moving on to Policy S7.2, we recognise that the LPCD aims to provide 16,632 new homes in the Borough between 2011/12 and 2031/32, at an annual average of 792 homes. Existing housing to set against this target includes 1,633 homes completed between 2011 and 2014, alongside 4,810 units on sites with existing planning permission and sites that are minded to be granted permission and are awaiting a section 106. Therefore, there is a requirement for the LPCD to provide 10,189 units between 2014 and 2032. Taking a requirement to provide 10,000 units over the remaining plan period equates to approximately 555 dwellings per annum over the next 18 years, which broadly speaking ties in with the housing figures contained within | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | our aforementioned position statement on the capacity of Howdon STW (although please note that these figures are for illustrative purposes only). It is however important to note that this position may be subject to change in coming years, as it is subject to levels of development growth in all Local Authority areas that drain to Howdon STW, alongside the influence of sustainable water separation schemes coming fully into effect. | | | | |
| 900521 | | RESIDENT | LP20151860 | We do not need that many houses, there are not enough schools to accommodate, one school is not enough. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 591119 | | | LP20151884 | I disagree with the number of houses you claim will be required during the lifetime of the plan. "ç Your own figures on migration show that there is only between 718 and 843 net migrants into the borough per year "ç Your own figures on empty properties show a sum of 3,239 "ç Your own (latest) figures on builds with permission total 5,603 and approved applications go back before 2004 "ç Your own (latest) figures on permitted builds show the top 8 sites with permission to build 4,023 "ç Of those 81% are on Greenfield sites "ç Of those 578 have been built "ç That's 3,445 Not built "ç That's 3,335 Not started Those figures do not match up with your claims of increased population of 22,000 by 2032 and therefore the need for "at least | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | 10,200 new homes "" in addition to about 5,000 homes already with planning permission" . 10,200 + 5,000 = 15,200 homes I suggest more realistically Average net migration inward = 780 per year = 11,700 over 15 years estimated average 2 people per home = 5,850 homes 5,850 minus 3,445 with permission but not yet built minus 3,239 existing empty properties ----- = - 834 Therefore there will be a surplus number of homes in the borough of North Tyneside. | | | | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151894 | NHSN believe that the plan is based on growth rates which are overly-ambitious and ignore earlier consultation feedback showing a public opinion for a lower rate of growth to save valued green spaces. In addition, evidence provided by North Tyneside Council to the examination in public for the Newcastle Core Strategy agreed that additional housing growth in Newcastle would capture households that might otherwise locate to North Tyneside. It was agreed that this would result in a reduced housing need for North Tyneside. Given this agreement we can not understand how the housing need for North Tyneside has gone up instead of down. We would draw your attention to the recent decision by the Planning Inspector for the County Durham Core Strategy who concluded that their plan was unsound because growth aspirations were unrealistic when taking into account the plans of neighbouring LPAs. Given neighbouring development plans we believe that a more realistic rate of growth for North Tyneside is around 600 new houses per year. This will support the economy and also meet | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | residents' demands to reduce building on green land. We can see no calculations in the plan that would suggest that a slightly lower figure of, for example 650 houses per year can not meet economic growth aspirations given the growth that will take place in neighbouring areas (i.e. provide employment for North Tyneside residents). | | | | |
| 769763 | Bellway Homes (NE) | DEVELOPER | LP20151928 | The housing requirement of 16,632 net additional dwellings between 2011/12 and 2031/2 or 792 dwellings per annum (dpa) represents a decrease upon the previous consultation version of the Plan which identified a requirement of 16,272 dwellings between 2013 and 2030 or 957dpa. Bellway consider that to provide a positive statement and to be in accordance with the NPPF which sets out the need to 'boost significantly' housing supply, the housing requirement in the policy should be expressed as a minimum. Bellway therefore recommend that the policy be reworded to:"To provide for the growth and development needed in North Tyneside to meet the Borough's Objectively Assessed Need for new homes provision is made for the development of 16, 632 homes from 2011112 to 2031132 at a minimum annual average of 792 new homes per year." | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 900788 | | DEVELOPER | LP20151991 | Our client objects to Policy S7.2. Whilst our client supports the aspirations of the Council to provide for the growth and development needed to meet the Borough's Objectively Assessed Housing Need, the provisions set out in Policy S7.2, to deliver 16,632 homes from 2011/12 to 2031/32 is an inaccurate reflection of the Borough's housing needs | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | over the plan period, as this figure is set too low. There is also a lack of alignment between the economic and housing aspirations for the Borough in terms of the jobs growth aspirations underpinning the economic and housing future for the Borough. Our client therefore recommends an upwards adjustment to the housing requirement to reflect North Tyneside's Objectively Assessed Housing Need as set out in the HEaDROOM Report, which will come under separate cover. As mentioned above, the HEaDROOM Report will be submitted after the consultation deadline following the publication of the full detailed 2012- based SNHP data from DCLG. | | | homes and employment opportunities. | |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152007 | PLEASE NOTE FIGURES 1-10 ARE IN THE ATTACHMENT Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) "" Strategic Housing and Policy S7.2 "" Housing Figures Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) sets out a strategic housing policy and S7.2 sets out a requirement to deliver an average of 792 dwellings per annum between 2011/12 and 2031/32. However, we note that the plan period will be 15 years from 2016/17 to 2032. Paragraph 7.10 of the Local Plan states that the detailed population and economic modelling work which supports the requirement is set out in the 2014 SHMA. The scenarios assessed include household projections, economic-led projections and alternative migration sensitivities. Table 3 of the Local Plan summarises the results of the modelling work with annual requirements ranging from 282 dwellings per annum (dpa) needed to support natural change (i.e. no | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Comments providing a robust consideration of the proposed housing growth in North Tyneside are welcomed. 1) What do the latest household projections conclude should be the starting point for an objective assessment of needs? Overall the previous set of household projections utilising an average of the 2008 and 2011 based household projections have been update to the 2012 based projections - published after completion of the 2015 Consultation Draft Local Plan. The preferred housing requirement for North Tyneside has consequently increased from 792 homes per year to 828 homes per year - reflecting the stated changes in household formation identified in the comment. 2) Are there local demographic factors which indicate a departure from household projections is necessary? The assessment of | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>migration) up to 1,789 dpa needed to achieve the higher economic forecast. The chosen scenario is "closest to trend based OAN, and supports the forecast medium job growth, this is based on a combination of scenarios; jobs led medium (lower net out commute), 10 Year Migration Trend, and Sub-National Population Projection (SNPP). This option results in a need for 792 homes per year" (paragraph 7.21 of the Local Plan). It is concluded that this scenario will result in job growth of around 654 jobs per annum. The consortium has tested the various components of the Council's choice of housing requirement, as follows: 1) What do the latest household projections conclude should be the starting point for an objective assessment of needs? 2) Are there local demographic factors which indicate a departure from household projections is necessary? 3) Are adjustments for economic growth required and if so what level of growth is appropriate? 4) Is an uplift to take account of market signals justified? 5) Is the Council's assumption that out-commuting will change justified? What do the latest household projections conclude should be the starting point for an objective assessment of needs? The 2012-based Household Projections (2012 HP) show that North Tyneside is projected to grow more and faster than any other local authority in Tyne and Wear and Northumberland (see figures 1 and 2). The 2012 Household Projections (which include the 2012 SNPP but crucially update headship rates from the Interim 2011 HP)</p> | | | <p>household need undertaken by the Council is informed by expertly prepared household forecasts. This tested a range of scenarios including the benchmark subnational projections, migration led projections over five and ten year periods and a range of alternatives considering the implications of differing levels of job growth, commuting and migration. Following the update to the 2012 household forecasts the Council do not consider the projection to be a departure. 3) Are adjustments for economic growth required and if so what level of growth is appropriate? General support for the Council;s assessment that job growth is likely to outstrip population growth in North Tyneside over the plan period - influencing the balance of commuting flows are welcomed. The implications and approach of our neighbours - particular at Northumberland and Newcastle forms an important component of discussions through the Duty to Co-operate. 4) Is an uplift to take account of market signals justified? The Council considers that the 2014 SHMA provides a suitably robust assessment of housing needs and housing market signals. The SHMA includes consideration of conditions in neighbouring authorities and an assessment of the relative performance of the borough. The overall assessment that market signals indicate the housing market in North Tyneside is "tight" is broadly agreed with. However, the assumption that in such circumstances a broad 10% uplift should</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>project growth in households of 17% over the period 2011 to 2031. This is significantly more than is projected in any of the Tyne and Wear authorities which collectively are projected to grow by around 12%, with Northumberland at just 9% growth. Figure 1: Household Projections for Tyne and Wear and Northumberland (Source 2012 Household Projections) Figure 2: Indexed (2011=1) Household Projections for Tyne and Wear and Northumberland (Source 2012 Household Projections) The household projections update the Council's "Sub-national Population Projection 2012" scenario which underestimates growth significantly (by around 45 dwellings per annum or 900 across the plan period). Given both of these scenarios utilise the same population input it is clear that the household formation rates (headship) in the latest projections have been increased significantly. In fact, a review of headship rates taken from the 2011 HP (which is used by the SHMA and by extension the LPCD) and the newly published 2012 HP reveals that the former significantly underestimates household formation in older cohorts. In particular figures 3, 4 and 5 set out how household formation is projected change in the 2011 HP1 and 2012 HP and show that the SHMA will underestimate the propensity for these cohorts to form new households and consequently underestimate housing needs as a whole, particular as the population is ageing. Figure 3 : Household formation rates of 65 to 74 year olds (Source 2012 Projections) 1 The 2011 HP project to 2021</p> | | | <p>simply be added to the evidence based scenarios for growth is not considered a robust solution. In addition, attention is drawn to the moderate market pressures described at a time when housing delivery within North Tyneside have ranged between 300 and 450 new homes per year. Through the Local Plan period an annual average rate of 828 homes per year is proposed and being planned for. There is no evidence of the performance of the housing market in North Tyneside with such a rate of housing delivery over the long term. Such an uplift may therefore be considered as part of the process of monitoring, implementation and delivery of the Local Plan - but is not appropriate to adjust the housing target itself.</p> <p>5) Is the Council's assumption that out-commuting will change justified? The broad support for the assumption that rates of out-commuting will change is welcomed. Again the implications of this is being considered and has formed a key part of our engagement through the duty to cooperate.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>and therefore are projected forward ten years to 2031 on the basis of the best fit trend for the projection 2011 to 2021. Figure 4: Household formation rates of 55 to 59 year olds (Source 2012 Household Projections) Figure 5: Household formation rates of 60 to 64 year olds (Source 2012 Household Projections) The starting point for an assessment of housing needs is the 2012 HP Projections which project a need for in excess of 805 dwellings per annum. In addition, new headship rates published with the 2012 HP should be utilised in the modelling work for all other scenarios including the economic-led scenarios. It is likely this will increase the overall need for housing. Are there local demographic factors which indicate a departure from household projections is necessary? Figure 6 sets out net migration in North Tyneside over time. It is clear that net migration has fluctuated significant since 2001/2 with a high of 1,112 persons in 2008 to a low of - 110 persons in 2012. Given these fluctuations, it is considered appropriate to take into account longer term trends. Another factor which has not been picked up by past migration trends or the 2012 SNPP is the influence of Un-attributable Population Change ("UPC"). UPC is the difference between the population estimate rolled forward from the 2001 Census and the Population estimate following the 2011 Census. In North Tyneside the Census revealed that there was an additional 1,800 people living in the Borough than was originally estimated. Whilst it is not possible</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>to fully and accurately account for how these people were mis-accounted for, it is likely that at least some if not most were under-recorded migrants. Figure 4 therefore adjusts past net migration to take account of UPC which has a significant and positive impact on past trends.2 2 This phenomena only affects the years between the Census as UPC was calculated using the 2011 Census. The 2012 SNPP does not account for UPC. If UPC has been a significant component of population change it is important to account for it in the demographic analysis of the SHMA. Figure 6: Migration estimates from the 2013 Revised Mid Year Estimates (Source ONS 2013 MYE) To assess the potential impact of considering longer term trends, figure 7 sets out net migration for a range of time period and include UPC where appropriate. It is clear that the SNPP (which is 2012 based and includes trends from the 5/6 years from 2006/7) contains a period of high migration when compared to the 12 year and most recent 6 year average. However, when UPC is included, this increases past migration averages significantly. Figure 7: Average Migration Rates from 2001/2 to 2012/13 Revised Mid Year Estimates (Source ONS 2013 MYE) It is therefore considered that the 2012 SNPP and the 2012 Household Projections which utilise the household projections could underestimate past migration on account of longer term trends and UPC. An upward adjustment on the basis of this evidence is therefore justified. Are adjustments for economic growth required and if so what</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>level of growth is appropriate? The Local Plan (at paragraph 7.22) states that 792 dpa will support a significant increase in the local economy of 654 jobs per annum. GVA has reviewed 2014 Experian Forecasts which conclude job growth of over 760 jobs per annum is forecast over the period 2011 to 2031, an increase of 16% over the job growth assumed in by the Local Plan. This level of economic growth forecast by Experian is the baseline forecast for the area and is considered to be principal projection for the Borough (i.e. is comparable to the 'medium growth' scenario put forward by the Council. Figure 8 shows that North Tyneside is forecast to grow at the fastest rate of any of the Tyne and Wear authorities (incl. Northumberland). This lends some credence to the Council's proposition that out-commuting will change over the plan period. This is because, as economic opportunities in the Borough become stronger relative to South East Northumberland and Newcastle upon Tyne residents who currently work in those areas will be more and more inclined to pursue local employment opportunities. Figure 8: Indexed forecasted employment growth 2011 to 2031 (Source Experian) Overall there is a justification for a greater increase in the level of jobs planned for through the plan given up to date economic forecast. It is also likely that commuting will change in response to the significant levels of growth forecast in the Borough (this is discussed further below). Is an uplift to take account of market signals justified? The 2014 SHMA at table 4.7 sets</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>out an assessment of housing market signals. This is not in line with the PPG. The PPG states that an assessment of market signals should be a relative one, comparing the performance of the local housing market to that of the wider housing market area and areas with comparable socio-economic characteristics. The 2014 SHMA does not undertake such an assessment and is therefore not considered robust. Notwithstanding, it would appear that in terms of affordability (see figure 9), the change since 1997 has been largely in line with the that of the surrounding area with a worsening of 59% compared to 61% in Newcastle, 66% in Gateshead 53% in South Tyneside and 54% in Northumberland. Figure 9: Indexed affordability ratio change 1997 to 2013 (Source: DCLG Live Tables) In terms of median house price change (see figure 10) however, North Tyneside has experienced the fastest growth across the period 1996 to 2013 with a growth of 218% compared to 212% in Gateshead, 204% in Newcastle upon Tyne, 210% in Northumberland. Figure 10: Indexed house price grown 1996 to 2012 (Source DCLG Live Tables) As described by the SHMA at paragraph 4.20, residential rents have been static, however vacancy rates are low and decreasing showing that demand is high relative to supply. Low vacancy rates increase friction in the housing market, reducing competition and compounding increasing house prices. They are symptomatic of a lack of supply relative to demand. Overall, whilst the picture is mixed, there would appear to be some indicators which are pointing to a</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>"tight' housing market which requires additional supply to meet demand. The PPG states that a worsening trend in any of the indicators will require an upward adjustment to planned housing numbers compared to those based solely on household projections. The 2012 HP are projecting an increase of around 805 dpa. The size of a market signals uplift is a matter of judgment, on which the PPG offers no specific advice. At an Examination in Public of Eastleigh's Local Plan (Hampshire) the EiP's Inspector's Preliminary Conclusions recommended a 10% uplift in response to market signals that indicated "modest' market pressures. Overall, given the issues associated with house increases house prices and falling vacancy rates, a modest increase in the region of 10% above household projections would seem appropriate. Is the Council's assumption that out-commuting will change justified? The housing and job requirement as set out in the Local Plan are predicated on a change in the commuting shift. On balance this is considered appropriate. Firstly, between the 2001 and 2011 Census, out-commuting fell in North Tyneside in response to an increase in local employment, particular business uses at the enterprise zone office parks at Quorum and Cobalt. This is detailed in the 2014 SHMA and its accompanying appendix by Edge Analytics. Secondly, the jobs economy in North Tyneside is forecast to grow at a faster rate than the surrounding area in future, further reducing the requirement for residents to leave the Borough for work.</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Notwithstanding, such a significant change in commuting rate will of course have an impact on the surrounding authorities and their housing / job balance. For example, Northumberland County Council is assuming within their Core Strategy that out-commuting to Newcastle and North Tyneside will fall. There is potentially a conflict here in terms of the ability of each authority to house fewer and fewer of the subregions' workforce. Notwithstanding the evidence which would seem to justify a change in commuting in North Tyneside, a political agreement with the surrounding authorities through a Duty to Cooperate process should be made to ensure that at the sub-regional level, the spatial strategy each authority is pursuing is appropriate, justified and deliverable and meet full objectively assessed needs for the entire wider housing market area. A trajectory for new housing In paragraph 7.29 it is set out that the Council will apply a 5% buffer onto the requirement of 792 homes per annum. However, when considering paragraph 47 of NPPF and the Council's Annual Monitoring Report 2013 it is the consortium's view that the Council has persistently failed on an annual basis to meet requirements. With the exception of years 2004 " 2008, the Council has failed to meet the housing requirement, including any of the years between 2008 and 2013. The recent under delivery, regardless of economic conditions, has been persistent and therefore under the terms of NPPF paragraph 47, the 20% buffer should be applied to the requirement. The Council will be aware of</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>well established case law on this point including the Burbage appeal which sets out that economic conditions are not a justification for under delivery and also the Cotswold judgement where the frequency of the under delivery was a key factor in establishing whether to apply the 5% or 20% buffer. The consortium also considers that in table 8, the total supply should not include 100% of sites with planning consent (or minded to grant) because there is significant evidence to demonstrate that historically, not all houses consented are constructed. It has been widely accepted that a 10% discount should be applied to planning permissions to give a more accurate reflection of realistic supply. The implication of this, alongside the consortium's view that the OAN should be higher, is a requirement for increased allocations or numbers of houses proposed on existing allocations in the local plan including at Killingworth Moor. Conclusions on Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) and S7.2 Overall, it is consortium's view that the Council's requirement of 792 would not meet objectively assessed need. Household projections show that older person household are likely to form at a faster rate than assumed by the 2014 SHMA resulting in an increase in total household growth of around 6%. This will have an impact on all of the modelled scenarios. In total, the household projections indicate a need for around 805 dpa. Longer term demographic trends would seem appropriate as would the inclusion of UPC which increase the baseline demographic</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>further. Up to date economic forecasts have revealed that the Council's chosen requirement would not meet the full needs of local businesses. An upward adjustment would be required to do so. Whilst the overall picture with regard to market signals is mixed, there are signs of moderate market pressure. It is concluded that upward adjustment of 10% over household projections is justified, increasing the annual requirement to at least 885 dpa (notwithstanding the additional growth in the jobs target and or demographic needs). This is the current view of the consortium. Notwithstanding, the consortium reserve the right to comment further on additional information. The Council should apply a 20% rather than 5% buffer to the requirement recognising the persistent under delivery against the requirement.</p> | | | | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152034 | <p>Policy S7.2 clearly highlights the Council's preferred option of growth alongside two other options for lower and higher growth within the LPA. Option B is set to deliver 792 dwellings per annum to a total of 16632 across the plan period. This level of growth as shown in the figures of paragraph 7.22 can only support 654 new jobs per annum. This growth scenario does not deliver the Council's own strategy for jobs growth across the plan period which is identified as at least 707 new jobs. Persimmon are keen to ensure that the policy and Plan are found sound through an EIP process at present this is a clear flaw in the economic and residential provision aims of the Plan. In addition to this we would like to take the opportunity to point out that</p> | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | <p>The level of new development is informed by a robust assessment of the borough Objectively Assessed Needs for development. The Council is required to follow this evidence based approach in order to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting the clear need of current and future residents of North Tyneside for new homes and employment opportunities.</p> | <p>The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | | housing target figures within local plans should not be considered a ceiling on development we would support in future iterations of this policy wording which sets the housing level as a minima. | | | | |
| 901136 | | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20152063 | <p>North Tyneside is part of a wider housing market which includes Newcastle, as demonstrated in the North Tyneside SHMA; a significant proportion of inflow of population is from Newcastle. Paragraph 7.31 of the Plan estimates approximately 1,000 people each year, particularly young families migrate from Newcastle. Newcastle and North Tyneside have worked closely to ensure that the proposed housing growth in our areas is complementary. The CSUCP aims to increase housing choice within Newcastle to reduce net migration losses, particularly of working age families to its neighbouring authorities, principally North Tyneside. Newcastle proposes to reduce the net loss in population from 2017-18, and by 750 per annum from 2020-21. If successful this would reduce historic patterns of migration from Newcastle to North Tyneside and support the stable level of growth set out in Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) of North Tyneside's Plan. In broad terms, Newcastle Council supports the preferred scenario. North Tyneside's Local Plan housing provision is based on the assumption of an increase in jobs over the SEP period to 2024, followed by baseline growth to 2032, which supports the forecast "medium" job growth and results in a need for 16,632 homes at an average of 792 homes per year. North Tyneside's 792 annual target represents an</p> | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Newcastle City Council's support for both the quantity and location of new housing proposed is noted. This support is considered to reflect the coherent and sustainable approach between neighbouring local authorities, an example of positive planning as part of the Duty to Cooperate. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | ambitious but realistic figure. Newcastle Council supports the sites and locations identified for housing and considers the approach to be sustainable. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152075 | RE New Site: Russell Square. Our client supports, in principle, the objective of the Local Plan to meet North Tyneside's objectively assessed housing need in order to support the growth and development needed in the Borough. However, our client considers the proposed housing requirement of 16,632 homes over the period 2011/12 and 2031/32 to be too low, which does not reflect the housing needs of the Borough, particularly to meet the economic aspirations of the Local Plan. It is noted that the housing requirement has been reduced from the previous of the Local Plan from 16,272 over the period 2013 to 2030. Our client considers that a robust justification has not been provided for this reduction. In addition, our client considers that the housing requirement should be expressed as a minimum target. This is to ensure that Policy S7.2 provides sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing conditions and that the objectively assessed housing needs are fully met. This will ensure that the policy is fully compliant with NPPF paragraph 14. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. In line with guidance, the starting point for determining this requirement is through consideration of the latest projections published by DCLG, which are derived from the ONS population forecasts. The full report is available to read on the Council website. At the time of publication of the LPCD 2013 the figure for the OAN for the borough was identified as 16,272 between 2013 and 2030, a total based on the latest evidence available at the time and average 926dpa. However, it must be noted that this was a figure and was identified as the maximum requirement, with the 2013 Policy S/SSSS7.2 (now 4.2) outlining that this total could be reduced to between 10,500 and 12,000 through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements. Since November 2013, the Population and Household Forecasts has been prepared as part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan, identifying the latest requirement, with the Council's preferred total being 16,632 new homes to 2032, at 792dpa. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152104 | RE New Site: Land to the south of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn. Our client supports, in principle, the objective of the Local Plan to meet North Tyneside's objectively assessed | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. In line with | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>housing need in order to support the growth and development needed in the Borough. However, our client considers the proposed housing requirement of 16,632 homes over the period 2011/12 and 2031/32 to be too low, which does not reflect the housing needs of the Borough, particularly to meet the economic aspirations of the Local Plan. It is noted that the housing requirement has been reduced from the previous of the Local Plan from 16,272 over the period 2013 to 2030. Our client considers that a robust justification has not been provided for this reduction. In addition, our client considers that the housing requirement should be expressed as a minimum target. This is to ensure that Policy S7.2 provides sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing conditions and that the objectively assessed housing needs are fully met. This will ensure that the policy is fully compliant with NPPF paragraph 14.</p> | | | <p>guidance, the starting point for determining this requirement is through consideration of the latest projections published by DCLG, which are derived from the ONS population forecasts. The full report is available to read on the Council website.</p> <p>At the time of publication of the LPCD 2013 the figure for the OAN for the borough was identified as 16,272 between 2013 and 2030, a total based on the latest evidence available at the time and average 926dpa. However, it must be noted that this was a figure and was identified as the maximum requirement, with the 2013 Policy S/SSS7.2 (now 4.2) outlining that this total could be reduced to between 10,500 and 12,000 through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements. Since November 2013, the Population and Household Forecasts has been prepared as part of the evidence base to support the Local Plan, identifying the latest requirement, with the Council's preferred total being 16,632 new homes to 2032, at 792dpa.</p> | Forecasts 2012 |
| 808018 | | RESIDENT | LP20152201 | <p>My only concern is the lack of planning/proposals for the projected housing increase? I can fully appreciate the need for more housing in the area (not sure of your projected figures!)</p> | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | <p>There are wide range of policies and proposals in the Local Plan which together set out the strategy to delivery the level of growth required to 2032. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development.</p> <p>The Local Plan outlines how the infrastructure, services and faculties needed</p> | <p>The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | to support this level of growth will be provided in order to make it deliverable - see Policy S10.1 (now 7.1) and the IDP for further detail. | |
| | | | LP20152231 | Census office figures in the last ten years show 3,000 houses are not justified for his area. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. In line with guidance, the starting point for determining this requirement is through consideration of the latest projections published by DCLG, which are derived from the ONS population forecasts. The full report is available to read on the Council website. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. It is currently considered that delivery from the proposed strategic site at Murton will be required over the plan period to meet this identified need and supplement delivery on brownfield sites. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152250 | The LPCD outlines a housing requirement of 16,632 equating to an average production rate of 792 dwellings per annum. This represents growth option B as outlined within emerging policy S7.2. the Murton Development Consortium agree with this approach. | | S 7.2 Housing Figures | Support for preferred level of housing growth noted. | The objectively assessed housing requirement has been updated to accord with DCLG Household Forecasts 2012 |
| 586329 | | RESIDENT | LP20159 | Site 78: Brownfield sites such as Chirton (adjacent to Norham Road in North Shields should be the first priority | Site 78 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is included in the Local Plan as a suggested allocation for mixed-use development. This proposal has also been made in light of the future need for employment land in the borough and consideration of the most appropriate sites to retain for this use, or otherwise release. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developabilit |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. | y of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. The emphasis remains on the identification of brownfield land. |
| 586329 | | RESIDENT | LP201510 | Site 35-41: it makes sense to bring forward the whole of Murton though to the first five years as it has long been identified as the most-sustainable of all the greenfield sites and also as it is large enough to sustain the whole of the borough's housing needs for so many years. If this is the direction taken (and it should be) the much of the loss of other areas would be unnecessary. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. The build programme will reflect the timescales needed to bring the site forward for development and then a build-out rate which is a reflection of housing need and market demand. | An indicative concept plan is included in the Local Plan pre-submission draft. The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence. This includes the assessment of the deliverability/developability and programme for development of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 586329 | | RESIDENT | LP201511 | Site 22-26: it makes sense to bring forward the whole of Murton though to the first five years as it has long been identified as the most-sustainable of all the greenfield sites and also as it is large enough to sustain the whole of the borough's housing needs for so many years, then Killingworth Moor should follow. If this is the direction taken (and it should be) the much of the loss of other areas would be unnecessary. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. The build programme will reflect the timescales needed to bring the site forward for development and then a build-out rate which is a reflection of housing need and market demand. | An indicative concept plan is included in the Local Plan pre-submission draft. The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence. This includes the assessment of the deliverability/developability and programme for development of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| 879024 | | RESIDENT | LP201516 | I have received the for plans to build thousands of houses on Killingworth Moor. I am deeply saddened to hear of this. The area is one which I frequently walk as do many others because this area is full of wildlife and is a small pocket of countryside in what is becoming a concrete world. I see all wildlife here, including Deer and Foxes. People generally use this area and enjoy getting outdoors. Many people cycle or simply stroll here. I live in Forest Hall and this patch is most precious. This area is so close to the Wagonway paths which are promoted and maintained by North Tyneside Council. If you look at the plan you can see that it will become just one big stretch of housing all the way to the coast. Neighbourhoods should have an escape without having to travel many miles. I note that one of the proposed site "West Moor" has been dropped. I can not understand that as the area suggested is not a area that people use or walk. It is wasteland. Yet you plan to build where people walk and enjoy and continue on from wagonway paths??? | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 878767 | | | LP201524 | Since the publication of the first Plan in November 2013, it would appear that a further 22 sites (site refs 111-143) have been identified or have become available for housing development. 17 of these new sites are brownfield. It is therefore quite reasonable to expect that more, | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence. This includes the assessment of the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | currently unidentified sites, will also become available for housing development during the planning period to 2032. Appropriate allowances for these currently unnamed sites should therefore be included in the list of potential sites for housing development. In addition, it would appear that no allowance has been made in the projected required future housing numbers for the residential units that it is hoped will be created from the conversion of existing and future vacant town centre shop units and premises above to residential units (see Policy DM6.4) and also the conversion of the existing Hotels and Guest Houses (and other existing redundant buildings) to residential units (see Policy AS5.8). Again appropriate allowances should be being made in the list of required development sites for housing for the residential properties that will be created from these property conversion policies. Incorporating these required adjustments into the list of potential sites for future housing may help defer or delay the need for carrying out some of the more unpopular large scale development of housing planned as necessary on the greenfield sites at Killingworth Moor and around Murton. | | | the Local Plan. The SHLAA is updated on an annual basis and each year additional sites are identified and assessed for development. From this assessment the most suitable sites have been selected for potential allocation. An allowance for windfall development is made through the Local Plan, based on past trends and evidenced through the SHLAA, which provides a small proportion of the total housing requirement to 2032. This windfall allowance includes forecast of potential supply from conversion of existing premises such as those in retail use or hotels. Further work will be undertaken, to identify any potential additional sites and to provide robust evidence to underpin the windfall allowance, before the next of the Local Plan. However despite a focus on brownfield development, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | deliverability/developability as outlined the 2015 SHLAA and a revised allowance for windfall delivery. |
| 879296 | | RESIDENT | LP201530 | Site 22 to 26: Retain as existing condition. | Site 22 to | S 7.3 Distribution of | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | 26 | Potential Housing Development Sites | | |
| 879296 | | RESIDENT | LP201532 | Site 35 to 41: Retain areas as existing condition. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 879298 | | RESIDENT | LP201534 | Site 11 now Site E0101: I object to East Benton Farm | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 879298 | | RESIDENT | LP201535 | Site 17: I object to Station Road West | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 879298 | | RESIDENT | LP201536 | The crease in the map provides a clue - most of the proposed sites for building are on the left and very few on the right. I wonder where you all live! | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now 4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence. This includes the assessment of the deliverability/developability as outlined in the 2015 SHLAA and a revised allowance for windfall delivery. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 882999 | | | LP201547 | Site 11 now Site E0101: I object to Site 11 now Site E0101. New build Station Road. Ref: 111,17. We already have the massive new build east of Station Road which was initially refused planning permission by North Tyneside Council. To now propose the above sites for new build seems hypocritical. The new estate will add to traffic congestion despite claims to the contrary, and also impact again on a Wildlife corridor. I feel these 2 additional sites should not go ahead. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now 7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 882999 | | | LP201548 | Site 17: I object to Site 17. New build Station Road. Ref: 111,17. We already have the massive new build east of Station Road which was initially refused planning permission by North | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | Tyneside Council. To now propose the above sites for new build seems hypocritical. The new estate will add to traffic congestion despite claims to the contrary, and also impact again on a Wildlife corridor. I feel these 2 additional sites should not go ahead. | | Sites | (now 7.3)and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | open space. |
| 890112 | Percy A Hudson Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP201552 | Site 54: With reference to the local plan consultation 2015, we write to inform you we are the owners of parts of Site 54 (SHLAA ref 284), Site 56 (SHLAA ref 282) & Site 57 (SHLAA ref 355). Our business occupies the sites listed above on a mix of leasehold and freehold basis. Our interest in the sites are not available for redevelopment and will not be made available for | Site 54 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This wider area of North Shields is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | redevelopment in the long term. | | | <p>simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. In this, the Council is aware of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site or will see any restriction placed upon current operations.</p> <p>The Council is committed to involving existing businesses and landowners in future proposals.</p> | |
| 890112 | Percy A Hudson Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP201553 | <p>Site 56: With reference to the local plan consultation 2015, we write to inform you we are the owners of parts of Site 54 (SHLAA ref 284), Site 56 (SHLAA ref 282) & Site 57 (SHLAA ref 355). Our business occupies the sites listed above on a mix of leasehold and freehold basis. Our interest in the sites are not available for redevelopment and will not be made available for redevelopment in the long term.</p> | Site 56 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>This wider area of North Shields is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. In this, the Council is aware of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site or will see any restriction placed upon current operations.</p> <p>The Council is committed to involving existing businesses and landowners in future proposals.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| 890112 | Percy A Hudson Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP201554 | Site 57: With reference to the local plan consultation 2015, we write to inform you we are the owners of parts of Site 54 (SHLAA ref 284), Site 56 (SHLAA ref 282) & Site 57 (SHLAA ref 355). Our business occupies the sites listed above on a mix of leasehold and freehold basis. Our interest in the sites are not available for redevelopment and will not be made available for redevelopment in the long term. | Site 57 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This wider area of North Shields is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. In this, the Council is aware of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site or will see any restriction placed upon current operations. The Council is committed to involving existing businesses and landowners in future proposals. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890120 | | RESIDENT | LP201555 | Site 35 - A good site for development in the future and master plan. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. |
| 890120 | | RESIDENT | LP201557 | Site 36 - A good site for development in the future and master plan. | Site 35 to 42 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|
| 890120 | | RESIDENT | LP201558 | Site 37 - A good site for development in the future and master plan. | Site 35 to 43 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 890120 | | RESIDENT | LP201560 | Site 38 - A good site for development in the future and master plan. | Site 35 to 44 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 890120 | | RESIDENT | LP201561 | Site 39 - A good site for development in the future and master plan. | Site 35 to 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 890120 | | RESIDENT | LP201562 | Site 40 - A good site for development in the future and master plan. | Site 35 to 46 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 890120 | | RESIDENT | LP201563 | Site 41 - A good site for development in the future and master plan. | Site 35 to 47 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 890120 | | RESIDENT | LP201564 | Site 38 - A good site for development in the future and master plan. | Site 35 to 48 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| 890129 | | RESIDENT | LP201566 | Road access out of Whitley Bay Monkseaton is now terrible even without road works. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now 7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890124 | | RESIDENT | LP201568 | Can't give alternative sites as there are none left unless we build on every green space and green belt which we will with population increase not controlled. If you must build more houses on green spaces, the places shown appear to be the only options, though as stated concerned about housing surrounding Rising Sun Country Park and Killingworth Lake. Green space is very important, priceless. Hope all brownfield sites are used first not just green space to make it cheaper for developers. Hard to see after this proposed building plans where there would be left to build apart from green belt and green spaces. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | No amendments proposed. |
| 462662 | | RESIDENT | LP201569 | Site 17 and permitted site 18 - Station Road / Rising Sun C.P. The site is a floodplain hence the proposal to dig ponds! Building on the site will stop rainwater escaping through the land, thus making the flooding worse! (Ponds tend to overflow when full). In the area how can tenants feel secure | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to flooding and ground conditions and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering matters of | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | and what value their homes? | | | flood risk and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 396697 | | RESIDENT | LP201571 | I like the site locations. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 536770 | | RESIDENT | LP201573 | Sites 22 to 36 Killingworth Moor and 35 - 41 Murton I strongly object to the development plan for these sites. Please stop building on green field sites. The Council should seek to protect as many greenfield and green belt sites from being developed as is possible. All identified brownfield sites should be developed for future employment and housing needs. I am so disappointed that the Council has allowed the Station Road housing development to go ahead. These green field sites should be protected. {NOTE: PLANNING OFFICER COMMENT>>> North Tyneside Council Planning Committee refused planning permission at this site. The developer appealed this decision and a report by an independent inspector and the secretary of state, overturned the decision and allowed the application.<<<] Utilise all brownfield sites as a matter of priority. Pull down | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>There is no proposal to make any changes to the existing boundaries of the North Tyneside Green Belt through the Local Plan. Station Road East - North Tyneside Council Planning Committee refused planning permission for this site. Subsequently, the developer appealed this decision and, following a report by an independent Inspector, the Secretary of State overturned the decision and allowed the application.</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | unused office and industrial sites and develop them for housing. | | | This site now has planning permission for 650 homes, delivery from which will contribute towards the overall housing requirement for the borough of the plan period. | |
| 590131 | | RESIDENT | LP201583 | I agree jobs then homes but not homes and hope for jobs. Also the roads are full at peak times and cars are queuing longer. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The housing requirement is informed by economic growth and jobs forecasts and are considered to be complementary. Once adopted, the Local Plan will ensure that the policies are in place to deliver a coherent strategy for future growth, including that new residential and employment development occurs at the right time and that the supporting infrastructure and facilities are in place to help support this development. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now 7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 890180 | | RESIDENT | LP201584 | Suggested new site - will you please get something done about the disgusting empty land at Kingsbridge. It had sheltered accommodation, empty for at least 6 years. When is the land at Longbenton where Somerville sheltered accommodation at Kingsbridge used to be. It has been empty at least 6 years. It is a disgrace, | Other | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A revised planning application relating to this site was permitted in October 2014 and redevelopment of the sheltered housing scheme is now underway. It is anticipated that this work will be completed by October 2015. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | full of rubbish, nothing is done about it. It is full of Wallsend, Killingworth etc. Nothing about Longbenton. | | | | 2015 SHLAA. |
| 890193 | | RESIDENT | LP201591 | No building work or houses should be built within Murton/ Shiremoor Areas. It is saturated in the area already. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 890193 | | RESIDENT | LP201592 | Site 35: Over saturation of housing. Loss of greenfields. Infrastructure will not cope. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing up to a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, biodiversity, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | |
| 890193 | | RESIDENT | LP201593 | Site 36: Over-saturation of housing. Loss of greenfields. Infrastructure will not cope. | Site 35 to 42 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The local plan sets out to ensure that overall levels of development required to meet the Borough objectively assessed needs for growth can be met without harm to the environment, character, and infrastructure capacity of the area. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890193 | | RESIDENT | LP201594 | Site 37: Over-saturation of housing. Loss of greenfields. Infrastructure will not cope. | Site 35 to 43 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The local plan sets out to ensure that overall levels of development required to meet the Borough objectively assessed needs for growth can be met without harm to the environment, character, and infrastructure capacity of the area. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890193 | | RESIDENT | LP201595 | Site 38: Over-saturation of housing. Loss of greenfields. Infrastructure will not cope. | Site 35 to 44 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The local plan sets out to ensure that overall levels of development required to meet the Borough objectively assessed needs for growth can be met without harm to the environment, character, and infrastructure capacity of the area. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| 890193 | | RESIDENT | LP201596 | Site 39: Over-saturation of housing. Loss of greenfields. Infrastructure will not cope. | Site 35 to 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The local plan sets out to ensure that overall levels of development required to meet the Borough objectively assessed needs for growth can be met without harm to the environment, character, and infrastructure capacity of the area. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890193 | | RESIDENT | LP201597 | Site 40: Over saturation of housing. Loss of greenfields. Infrastructure will not cope. | Site 35 to 46 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The local plan sets out to ensure that overall levels of development required to meet the Borough objectively assessed needs for growth can be met without harm to the environment, character, and infrastructure capacity of the area. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890193 | | RESIDENT | LP201599 | Site 41: Over-saturation of housing. Loss of greenfields. Infrastructure will not cope. | Site 35 to 47 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The local plan sets out to ensure that overall levels of development required to meet the Borough objectively assessed needs for growth can be met without harm to the environment, character, and infrastructure capacity of the area. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP201598 | Site 21: I object to the development of this site. | Site 21 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP2015100 | Site 24: I object to the development of this site. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP2015101 | Site 25: I object to the development of this site. | Site 22 to 27 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|--|---|
| 463028 | | | LP2015102 | Site 26: I object to the development of this site. | Site 22 to 28 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP2015103 | Site 29: I object to the development of this site. | Site 29 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP2015104 | Site 17: Ideally this site should be left undeveloped. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 463028 | | | LP2015105 | Site 18: Ideally this site should be left undeveloped. | Site 18 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Following refusal of planning permission by North Tyneside Council Planning Committee, the developer appealed this decision, and a report by an independent Inspector and the Secretary of State overturned the decision and allowed the application. This site now has planning permission for 650 homes, delivery from which will contribute towards the overall housing requirement for the borough of the plan period. | No amendments proposed. |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015106 | Murton- What is the point of consultation when developers already own the land? | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The ownership of a site does not predetermine suitability for development. The SHLAA considers a wide range of site constraints and factors, including landownership, before making a conclusion as to the suitability and deliverability for housing. Following this, even if allocated | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | through the Local Plan, a planning application would have to be submitted, considered and approved before development could take place. | |
| 463028 | | | LP2015107 | Site 77: There are plenty of brownfield sites available for development such as this one. | Site 77 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is included in the Local Plan as a suggested allocation for mixed-use development. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP2015108 | Site 78: There are plenty of brownfield sites available for development such as this one. | Site 78 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is included in the Local Plan as a suggested allocation for mixed-use development. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP2015109 | Site 106: There are plenty of brownfield sites available for development such as this one. | Site 106 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Site 106 is included for assessment in the SHLAA (Site 488). However, it is considered that the site is currently unsuitable for housing development, reflecting locational factors and site constraints, therefore it has not been considered as a potential housing allocation through the Local Plan process. On consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retain as employment land (NT001), meeting the economic growth and development needs of the borough over the plan period. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP2015110 | Site 107: There are plenty of brownfield sites available for development such as this one. | Site 107 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | Site 107 is included for assessment in the SHLAA (Site 512). However, it is considered that the site is currently unsuitable for | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | Housing Development Sites | housing development, reflecting locational factors and site constraints, therefore it has not been considered as a potential housing allocation through the Local Plan process. On consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retain as employment land (NT027), meeting the economic growth and development needs of the borough over the plan period. | |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015112 | Site 35: What is the point of consultation when developers already own the land? | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The ownership of a site does not predetermine suitability for development. The SHLAA considers a wide range of site constraints and factors, including landownership, before making a conclusion as to the suitability and deliverability for housing. Following this, even if allocated through the Local Plan, a planning application would have to be submitted, considered and approved before development could take place. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP2015111 | New site: another suitable site is the field behind Proctor and Gamble, between Whitley Road and the metro line. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Site 11 now Site E010 is included for assessment in the SHLAA (Site 499). However, it is considered that the site is currently unsuitable for housing development, reflecting locational factors and site constraints, therefore it has not been considered as a potential housing allocation through the Local Plan process. On consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retain as employment land (NT012), | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | meeting the economic growth and development needs of the borough over the plan period. | |
| 890396 | | RESIDENT | LP2015147 | New site: what about more houses on empty land in Seaton Burn near the A19 roundabout. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 384). The SHLAA currently concludes that this site is unsuitable for residential development due to this designation. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP2015113 | New site: the derelict buildings near East Holywell could also be a site for houses. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 11 now Site E0102). The SHLAA currently concludes that this site is unsuitable for residential development due to this designation. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | No amendments proposed. |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015114 | Site 36: What is the point of consultation when developers already own the land? | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development | The Local Plan process seeks to ensure the best and most sustainable approach to delivering the needs for the borough can be achieved. Engagement with a range of companies, organisations and the residents | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | Sites | of the Borough is key to ensuring all the issues associated with that can be identified, considered and addressed. | |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015115 | Site 37: What is the point of consultation when developers already own the land? | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan process seeks to ensure the best and most sustainable approach to delivering the needs for the borough can be achieved. Engagement with a range of companies, organisations and the residents of the Borough is key to ensuring all the issues associated with that can be identified, considered and addressed. | No amendments proposed. |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015116 | Site 38: What is the point of consultation when developers already own the land? | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan process seeks to ensure the best and most sustainable approach to delivering the needs for the borough can be achieved. Engagement with a range of companies, organisations and the residents of the Borough is key to ensuring all the issues associated with that can be identified, considered and addressed. | No amendments proposed. |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015117 | Site 39: What is the point of consultation when developers already own the land? | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan process seeks to ensure the best and most sustainable approach to delivering the needs for the borough can be achieved. Engagement with a range of companies, organisations and the residents of the Borough is key to ensuring all the issues associated with that can be identified, considered and addressed. | No amendments proposed. |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015118 | Site 40: What is the point of consultation when developers already own the land? | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan process seeks to ensure the best and most sustainable approach to delivering the needs for the borough can be achieved. Engagement with a range of companies, organisations and the residents of the Borough is key to ensuring all the issues associated with that can be identified, considered and addressed. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|---|--|
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015119 | Site 41: What is the point of consultation when developers already own the land? | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan process seeks to ensure the best and most sustainable approach to delivering the needs for the borough can be achieved. Engagement with a range of companies, organisations and the residents of the Borough is key to ensuring all the issues associated with that can be identified, considered and addressed. | No amendments proposed. |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015121 | Site 35: Can you guarantee there will be no vehicular access to the estate at Murton from Westward Green/ Cauldwell Lane? | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015122 | Site 36: Can you guarantee there will be no vehicular access to the estate at Murton from Westward Green/ Cauldwell Lane? | Site 35 to 42 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan includes an indicative concept plan for the development of Murton. This does not include any vehicular access from Murton to Seatonville Road, via Cauldwell Avenue or any other street. A key objective for managing the traffic impacts of any development at Murton will be to ensure that traffic is directed away from Seatonville Road to avoid contributing to | An indicative concept plan is included in the Local Plan pre-submission draft. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | issues of infrastructure capacity at this road and the Foxhunters junction. | |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015123 | Site 36: Can you guarantee there will be no vehicular access to the estate at Murton from Westward Green/ Cauldwell Lane? | Site 35 to 43 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan includes an indicative concept plan for the development of Murton. This does not include any vehicular access from Murton to Seatonville Road, via Cauldwell Avenue or any other street. A key objective for managing the traffic impacts of any development at Murton will be to ensure that traffic is directed away from Seatonville Road to avoid contributing to issues of infrastructure capacity at this road and the Foxhunters junction. | An indicative concept plan is included in the Local Plan pre-submission draft. |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015124 | 38: Can you guarantee there will be no vehicular access to the estate at Murton from Westward Green/ Cauldwell Lane? | Site 35 to 44 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan includes an indicative concept plan for the development of Murton. This does not include any vehicular access from Murton to Seatonville Road, via Cauldwell Avenue or any other street. A key objective for managing the traffic impacts of any development at Murton will be to ensure that traffic is directed away from Seatonville Road to avoid contributing to issues of infrastructure capacity at this road and the Foxhunters junction. | An indicative concept plan is included in the Local Plan pre-submission draft. |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015125 | Site 39: Can you guarantee there will be no vehicular access to the estate at Murton from Westward Green/ Cauldwell Lane? | Site 35 to 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan includes an indicative concept plan for the development of Murton. This does not include any vehicular access from Murton to Seatonville Road, via Cauldwell Avenue or any other street. A key objective for managing the traffic impacts of any development at Murton will be to ensure that traffic is directed away from Seatonville Road to avoid contributing to issues of infrastructure capacity at this road and the Foxhunters junction. | An indicative concept plan is included in the Local Plan pre-submission draft. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015126 | Site 40: Can you guarantee there will be no vehicular access to the estate at Murton from Westward Green/ Cauldwell Lane? | Site 35 to 46 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan includes an indicative concept plan for the development of Murton. This does not include any vehicular access from Murton to Seatonville Road, via Cauldwell Avenue or any other street. A key objective for managing the traffic impacts of any development at Murton will be to ensure that traffic is directed away from Seatonville Road to avoid contributing to issues of infrastructure capacity at this road and the Foxhunters junction. | An indicative concept plan is included in the Local Plan pre-submission draft. |
| 791197 | | RESIDENT | LP2015127 | Site 41: Can you guarantee there will be no vehicular access to the estate at Murton from Westward Green/ Cauldwell Lane? | Site 35 to 47 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan includes an indicative concept plan for the development of Murton. This does not include any vehicular access from Murton to Seatonville Road, via Cauldwell Avenue or any other street. A key objective for managing the traffic impacts of any development at Murton will be to ensure that traffic is directed away from Seatonville Road to avoid contributing to issues of infrastructure capacity at this road and the Foxhunters junction. | An indicative concept plan is included in the Local Plan pre-submission draft. |
| 890396 | | RESIDENT | LP2015130 | Site 22-26: Killingworth Moor - too many houses - not leaving enough green spaces - | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing up to a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, biodiversity, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 890408 | | | LP2015135 | The Holystone Bypass (A191) is already very busy and almost impossible for pedestrians and cyclists to cross at peak times accessing the local fields. This area has not been marked for any traffic management improvements. Houses behind Devonshire Drive (Area 21) offer no direct access to the Bypass thus there would be an increase in traffic in an area that has already has traffic calming measures in effect Removing the area at site 21 removes the last close green area accessible in the immediate area that is not hemmed in by a Major A Road thus is safe for children to play on Local facilities are already strained, the example is Holystone Primary School is already one of the largest in the area and is very over-subscribed which already creates excessive traffic There is a very strong local feeling against further development in the Holystone area, as shown by the 3,500+ signature petition handed to the council around 2012 by the Holystone Action Group. There are many possibilities in North Tyneside, including the area around | Site 21 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. This includes improvements to cycling and walking infrastructure, integral to any proposal, and ensuring safe access. As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. The importance of community services and facilities, including schools, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now 7.1) which outline how the Council will | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | Norham Road. New business has already started to move into this area so why not expand it further? | | | enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 890408 | | | LP2015136 | Site 21: I object to the development of this site. | Site 21 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 890440 | | RESIDENT | LP2015138 | Site 35 to 41: I believe better use of land could reduce need to extend so far into the limited inner suburban green space. Areas 35 to 41 should be split in half. Build to west, protect to east. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing up to a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, biodiversity, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 792504 | | | LP2015140 | Site 17: developing this site will merge Benton into Palmersville and Wallsend and should be removed and retained as an open space. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 890857 | | RESIDENT | LP2015173 | Regarding Killingworth Moor and Murton - why are they "protected" so that Murton Village and Killingworth Village won't merge with surrounding areas but you wish to allow my village, Annitsford, to merge with Dudley. | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Site 3, Annitsford Farm, has been identified as a suggested location for development of 400 homes. Although there is no formal strategic settlement buffer proposed, any development of this land would have to incorporate significant areas of open space, maintaining and enhancing for both ecological and recreational purposes. Therefore, careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 890404 | | | LP2015141 | Site 3: The area shown at Annitsford may not be suitable for housing as it was once a dumping ground for colliery waste and at one time the area was part of a lake, so buildings will be subject to possible flooding, subsidence and possible methane gas from the old mine workings. | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Any proposal for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to site contamination, ground conditions and flooding and, if necessary, identify measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering matters of contamination, flooding and the overall suitability of the site. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 792504 | | | LP2015142 | Site 22 to 26: the loss of Killingworth Moor is not acceptable. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 792504 | | | LP2015143 | New site: We would also like to see more vacant properties used - i.e. the empty offices in Forest Hall belonging to the Council. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>The next review of the SHLAA will include consideration of any empty office premises in Forest Hall which may have potential for housing development/conversion.</p> | including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 792504 | | | LP2015156 | New site: What of the number of empty houses in the borough or council properties lying empty such as Irving House in Forest Hall could they be better utilised? More use of brownfield sites rather than losing farmland and open breathing spaces for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>The next review of the SHLAA will include consideration of any empty office premises in Forest Hall which may have potential for housing development/conversion.</p> | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 890843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015161 | Some sites apparently conflict with 'wildlife corridor'. Not good: clearly both the strategic area plans have issues with that. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. National planning policy requires LPAs to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife and the Local Plan seeks to</p> | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. | |
| 890854 | | RESIDENT | LP2015169 | Site 35 to 41: no housing around Murton Village. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 890854 | | RESIDENT | LP2015170 | New site: south of Seghill or east of Seaton Burn would be less damaging to the heritage of the borough (than building around Murton) | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now 4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developabilit |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. The land south of Seghill and east of Seaton Burn is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt. Some of the land in this area is assessed in the SHLAA but it is concluded that it is unsuitable for residential development due to this designation. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | y of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 890857 | | RESIDENT | LP2015172 | Site 3: I object to this site - Dudley and Annitsford will merge in to one. | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The detailed design and layout of a potential development scheme will take into account the need to maintain significant areas of accessible open space within the development, including in order to maintain a gap between settlements, support wildlife habitats and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 890859 | | RESIDENT | LP2015176 | New site: alternative locations for housing to reduce the numbers on Murton and Killingworth - use of small sites such as the old Marine Park School in Whitley Bay . | Site 48 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This particular site is included in the Local Plan (Site 48) as a potential allocation for 41 homes. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 890859 | | RESIDENT | LP2015178 | Site 48: I support development of small sites such as the old Marine Park School | Site 48 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015182 | Site 35 to 41: My preference would be the development of the old farmland on Murton Estate. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 890925 | | RESIDENT | LP2015186 | Site 35 to 41: I object to development of Murton. There is excessive traffic in this area already - especially Rake Lane - and this will greatly add to the problem. I ride from Murton Riding School and this will severely affect their riding space - spoiling what little | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing up to a maximum of | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | countryside is still available. | | | 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, biodiversity, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 890925 | | RESIDENT | LP2015187 | Most sites so far in progress contain high end luxury homes not within the reach of many. | Other | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developabilit |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | y of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 891027 | | | LP2015190 | Site 22 to 26: is unsustainable and I strongly reject the council's plans to use this land for housing. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 891067 | | RESIDENT | LP2015192 | Site 22 to 26: I would object to this site because of the disruption caused during the lengthy development, and because of increased occupation of a quiet neighbourhood. I do not have an alternative suggestion, nor should I. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. The approval of a planning application for development will include conditions that aim to limit the disruption and impact of construction works on existing residents. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 891068 | | RESIDENT | LP2015194 | The sites are on green open space, which is shrinking rapidly! These sites | General | S 7.3 Distribution of | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including | The sites allocated for housing development |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | of yours are claustrophobic and smothering. Hemming us in! Utilise sites with planning permission (e.g. Smith's Dock and Station Road East). Are there not community centres, no play areas for kids on these sites or any new housing estate sites. Use blue and brown reclaimed sites, protect our green sites as long as possible. | | Potential Housing Development Sites | in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. The importance of community services and facilities is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 891663 | | RESIDENT | LP2015200 | Comment 1 - Site 35 to 41: Land from West Monkseaton metro to Murton This is greenfield farming land and currently being developed to accommodate flood defences such as reservoirs / pits etc... why is this area earmarked. I was told by one/two of your engineers only months ago that the land which had flooded between West Monkseaton and Murton would not be developed as it was housing a protected bird... Stop going back on your promises and deal with the problems the area already has instead of creating new ones. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing up to a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, biodiversity, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing improvement works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 891827 | | RESIDENT | LP2015204 | Site 17: I object to building next to the Rising Sun Country Park. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 891828 | | RESIDENT | LP2015205 | Site 3: I understand the need for more housing but I am strongly opposed to building on Site 3 Annitsford Farm. This is the only green land we have and is full of natural wildlife. Dudley does not have the roads and infrastructure to deal with the massive increase of housing on Site 3. It is a flood risk, danger to wildlife, increases estate | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of site issues and constraints, including those relating to environmental impact, flood risk and adjacent land uses and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | traffic, is dangerous in location to chemical plant and a flight path. | | | considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now 7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For Annitsford Fm, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network. | |
| 891828 | | RESIDENT | LP2015206 | Site 2: I support development of Grieves Row, Dudley - this is a suitable alternative to Site 3 Annitsford Farm. | Site 2 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. This site is identified as a suggested housing allocation in the Local Plan with potential delivery already forecast to contribute towards the housing requirement. | No amendments proposed. |
| 891828 | | RESIDENT | LP2015207 | Site 142: I support development of Land at Burradon Road/Front Street - this is a suitable alternative to Site 3 Annitsford Farm. | Site 142 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. This site is identified as a suggested housing allocation in the Local Plan with potential delivery already forecast to contribute towards the housing requirement. | No amendments proposed. |
| 891861 | | RESIDENT | LP2015214 | New site: We would like to know why the land adjacent to Bromley Avenue and the back of Appletree Gardens has not been considered, as this would be more suitable for private or local authority housing | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Suggested noted. This site will be included in the next review of the SHLAA in order to be assessed for suitability and ultimately deliverability/developability for housing. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 891861 | | RESIDENT | LP2015215 | Site 45: With regard to the proposed housing development on the green adjacent to Churchill Avenue, Baytree Gardens and Cedartree Gardens. We think this is not a very good idea because not only is this the only green space on this estate but we feel it would be more beneficial if it could be developed into a decent play area for both young and older children, as these facilities are not available in this area. Extra housing and traffic would cause more congestion in and around Appletree Gardens school, which is very bad at certain times of the day. Whatever decision is taken we hope that extra traffic and parking facilities will be well taken care of, because it can be difficult at the moment. Could you please keep us informed of any new developments for this land. Thank you. | Site 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. The suggestion of improvements to existing open space will be considered including, if necessary, through the Local Plan process. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. | No amendments proposed. |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015216 | Site 5: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly | Site 5 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | negative impact due to their size and/or location include: | | | recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015217 | Site 11 now Site E010: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 11 | Site 11 now Site E010 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT031). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015218 | Site 17: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 17 | | Sites | development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015219 | Site 29: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 29 | Site 29 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015220 | Site 34: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A | Site 34 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 34 | | Housing Development Sites | Plan (part NT030). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015221 | Site 106: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 106 | Site 106 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT001). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015222 | Site 109: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 109 | Site 109 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT058). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015223 | Site 139: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 139 | | | careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015224 | Site 22 - 26: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 22-26 | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015225 | Sites 35 - 41: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 35-41 | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015226 | Site 46: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or | Site 46 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 46 | | | development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015227 | Site 59: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 59 | Site 59 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015228 | Site 68: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these | Site 68 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 68 | | | scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015229 | Site 74: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 74 | Site 74 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015230 | Site 77: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will | Site 77 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 77 | | | careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015231 | Site 78: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 78 | Site 78 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015232 | Site 9, now Site E008, 9: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed | Site 9, now Site E008, | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 99 | 9 | Development Sites | corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015233 | Site 107: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 107 | Site 107 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015234 | Site 11 now Site E0109: I would like to comment on one aspect of the | Site 11 | S 7.3 Distribution of | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 119 | now Site E0109 | Potential Housing Development Sites | ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | Local Plan. |
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015235 | Site 141: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 141 | Site 141 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| 891883 | | RESIDENT | LP2015236 | Site 143: I would like to comment on one aspect of the suggested sites for development in the local plan. A number of the proposed development sites lie within the boundaries of protected wildlife corridors, and will either restrict or severely restrict the movement of wildlife along these corridors. I believe these sites should be reduced in size, relocated, or abandoned. Sites with a particularly negative impact due to their size and/or location include: 143 | Site 143 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 468309 | | RESIDENT | LP2015239 | New site: overall I agree with this key proposals info. My only question is: the old pit buildings and land at the back-end of Backworth have stood wasting for years. Surely some housing or factories could be built there? (on the road to Earsdon) | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 11 now Site E0102). The SHLAA currently concludes that this site is unsuitable for residential development due to this designation. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 892126 | Tecaz Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015240 | Site 78: Further to your invitation for interested parties to "Have Your Say", I think it prudent to put down what we | Site 78 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | This West Chirton South site is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to develop a wider | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>would like considered, and hopefully improve the feasibility of any future plan whilst also putting forward our concerns. We feel that we should make you aware of these, so that any proposal adopted will not have a detrimental impact on our business and relationship with local residents. Over the last 10 years various proposed 'Master Plans' have been put forward with the admirable objective of improving the Chirton Industrial Estate area. We obviously fully support any proposal which leads to a much needed sustainable regeneration of the area, however we have had worries of what impact these will have on our business. As you may be aware we have traded from our present premises on Norham Road since 1985 and presently employ 61 staff at this outlet. This premises is our Head Office and primary warehouse facility, serving our other stores in Ryhope Sunderland, Portrack Lane, Stockton and a new development in Pennywell Sunderland. In addition we dispatch almost all of our internet sales from this building and currently our web based trade is rapidly increasing. The last 12 months has seen a marked improvement in all aspects of our dealings, which is one of the reasons that we are adding the Pennywell location to our operations. However any disruption to our planned growth in North Shields would be</p> | | Housing Development Sites | <p>regeneration programme for the area. It also reflects the current application relating to part of the site (14/01018/OUT) for which a decision is pending. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. This will help to avoid any threat of piecemeal development. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. In this, the Council is aware of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site or will see any restriction placed upon current operations. The Council is committed to involving existing businesses and landowners in future proposals.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>extremely damaging to our overall business. Our Norham Road store is well known in the North Tyne area and we spend considerable sums on a yearly basis advertising its present location, and are therefore fully committed to our retail store in this area for the foreseeable future. Furthermore we have invested heavily in its IT systems to enable communication between our stores and escalating internet traffic. We also engage a kitchen business in the Chirton estate, whose production is almost entirely for sales from our 3 stores and this employs a further 15 Staff. Our agents Sanderson Weatherall have written on a number of occasions detailing our difficulties should any future development include domestic housing immediately adjacent to our premises. I enclose copies of two of the most recent letters which illustrate the problems we could encounter, one dated 24th July 2014 and also one sent on the 26th August 2014. We feel that there are problems in the piecemeal way that this area is possibly evolving, with housing proposed in between retail, bus depot and warehouse operations, giving the impression of a lack of coordinated strategy. This has been probably partly caused by proposed long term plans not coming to fruition, causing a blight on improvements,</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>which existing business's would have invested in. Unfortunately, in our case, this has lead to a lack of confidence in committing finance to any major development of our site, being unable to risk radically improving our premises or look to increase our warehousing, by applying for planning to renew and extend our building. We do feel that the original direction of future development outlined in the McKellar 'Master Plan' of 2005 seemed to contain much more sustainable, integrated and viable proposals than the fragmented options presently being discussed. We do understand why these are being floated as there is a natural impatience with how slowly plans have progressed so far, which we are sure has lead to the same problems with 'planning blight' that we have encountered. We also appreciate that the withdrawal of Tesco's involvement, through their financial difficulties, where previously they spearheaded any improvements, made alteration to the overall plan necessary, but this should not have altered the general direction of the Council's approach. We therefore welcome the Council asking for feedback but in view of the above would appreciate early positive indications of what is planned for the Chirton Industrial Estate and North Shields area. In addition a measure of certainty that what is planned for will</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | ensure the viability of our business, and enable us to confidently plan for the future. | | | | |
| 892139 | | RESIDENT | LP2015241 | Site 35 to 41: I am absolutely horrified that Murton Village would no longer survive with our footpaths, riding school, fields for horses. I bought a house purposely to be away from the housing schemes only to be told I could be surrounded by homes etc - not pleased at all. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing up to a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 892165 | | RESIDENT | LP2015243 | Site 22 to 26: objection. I would like to see Site 22 - 26 maintained as non developed for either housing, commercial or industrial use. Keep it 'OPEN' as it is. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| | | | LP2015244 | Site 22 to 26: I would like to see Killingworth Moor kept as a 'green' open space. I would like to see the projected 2,000 homes built on existing/derelict land - as the 'Norgas' development by the lakes. The future generation need open rural space. The industrial/employment needs can be met by Cobalt extensions. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) (now Policies S1.4 and S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>The future employment and economic growth requirements of the borough mean that further employment land is required in addition to Cobalt. It is considered that Killingworth Moor could help to meet some of this requirement.</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 892412 | | | LP2015257 | Site 35-41. Not happy that you are planning to build further homes around an area that is currently away from the congestion and used for farming and horses. However also | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure. This includes | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>concerned that the road that will cut through this area to Earsdon will bring also increased noise and pollution to the rear of my property thus not only decreasing it's value, but also adding no value/access to the area of my residence. I understand from the consultation evening that this road is to ease congestion from the A191 to the Monkseaton High School roundabout (past the hospital), but this is not curing the underlying issue - more houses - more traffic, and honestly we are running out of green area to build. Better to solve the congestion/access issues around A19/Silverlink/Cobalt and focus on the funding required to promote Nexus connecting the rail network allowing better public transport links. Please consider that this road is not wanted, and if absolutely necessary please consider the distance from all properties in attempt to reduce noise/pollution and indeed potential de-valuation that this will bring to properties in Murton and surrounding areas where this could affect.</p> | | Sites | <p>schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> | <p>the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |
| 892444 | | RESIDENT | LP2015259 | <p>Site 22 to 26: More 'greenspace' disappears whilst the river Tyne is mostly a post industrial waste dump! Willington Quay has a natural tidal salt marsh and potential for excellent riverside housing and marina. No foresight or inclination to regenerate!</p> | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in the strategic areas of Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst seeking an overall distribution of remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, in Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>strategy and is followed by site-specific assessment, including consideration of the suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, to select the range of suggested allocations.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing up to a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for</p> | <p>wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | |
| 892444 | | RESIDENT | LP2015260 | Site 35 to 41: More 'greenspace' disappears whilst the river Tyne is mostly a post industrial waste dump! Willington Quay has a natural Tidal Salt Marsh and potential for excellent riverside housing and a marina. No foresight or inclination to regenerate! | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in the strategic areas of Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst seeking an overall distribution of remaining development needs across the urban area.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing up to a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | |
| 798736 | | | LP2015265 | Site 35 to 41: I am horrified at the scale of potential development proposed on the Murton Village site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing up to a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 630486 | | | LP2015269 | This plan is all 'suggestions', the reality is not at all as 'suggestion'(!!) implies. Once these housing areas are in place - where will all the cars be parked - on streets? | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. Importantly this includes consideration of | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | parking, something also guided by the supporting supplementary planning guidance in LDD12. | including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 630486 | | | LP2015272 | Site 27: Lived here since 1970s - bus service deplorable - council overlooked all complaints. Would be just another (larger) isolated estate - wake up and think and look. | Site 27 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) recognises the importance of public transport and includes a specific objective to improve bus services by working with Nexus and the bus operators. The site allocation process looks to select the most sustainable, accessible options for housing and opportunities will be explored to maximise accessibility, delivering improvements as part of the planning process. | No amendments proposed. |
| 892229 | | RESIDENT | LP2015286 | Site 22 to 26: Killingworth should be separated by a decent green along Killingworth Way. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| 892824 | | RESIDENT | LP2015291 | <p>Site 21: Our thanks for the Summary Document of the Local Plan. We would like to draw attention to issues concerning the development of area 21. The drainage of the area flows from the current Holystone housing estate onto the field which Area 21 currently is. In periods of heavy rain, when the street drains have been overloaded, water has loaded into this area which has acted as a natural sink. It seems not many months- but was probably two years ago- that there was flooding in the Devonshire Drive area, and this would likely have affected more homes had there not been that area to which the water could run off. In the scenario that the area is used for the option of additional housing, the existing households will be lost. We advocate the proposed development threatens increase in flooding risks to existing households and should be considered as unacceptable. The accessibility of the site is currently by pedestrian path on its easterly tip and from an opening onto Devonshire Drive on its southern tip, The latter would be a possible future road link to the development increasing traffic flow on Devonshire Drive and exacerbating flow, particularly at school-run times. The maintenance of the roadway is currently of a poor standard, with a section that has not been tarmacked since the original estate. The indicated</p> | Site 21 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to flooding and ground conditions and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering matters of flood risk and the overall suitability of the site.</p> <p>As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision.</p> <p>The importance of community services and facilities, including schools, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>plot is currently a green which is used as a recreation area and provides a football pitch for general use and area used for local play and dog walking. The development of this into a housing area would be a qualitative loss to the existing community.</p> | | | <p>supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. This includes improvements to cycling and walking infrastructure, integral to any proposal, and ensuring safe access.</p> | |
| 892836 | | RESIDENT | LP2015294 | <p>Site 35 to 41: This is unnecessary. Even after consultation and a master plan North Tyneside will be overcrowded - we don't need or want this. If more houses are required use brownfield land sites only, keep the fields as they are. We cannot cope with current traffic levels - try leaving Whitley Bay between 7:30 and 9am on work days.</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> | |
| 892866 | | RESIDENT | LP2015298 | Site 22 to 26: object to development on Killingworth Moor | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 892866 | | RESIDENT | LP2015299 | New site: consider Camperdown (instead of Killingworth Moor) or just stop building! | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | Development Sites | plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. | reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| | | | LP2015309 | Site 45: object to development on this land as this is the only place where local children can play together. | Site 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893153 | | RESIDENT | LP2015311 | Site 139: Opposition to the plans to build on the green field sites around Benton I wish to oppose the plans to build on green fields around the Benton area on the following grounds: 1. The area would become entirely built on whereas it is a mixed area at present with buildings and fields. Many people use the foot paths for daily exercise 2. I do not believe that the needs of existing residents have been considered. The green fields are good | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>for well-being. The view over to Gateshead would be lost for ever. 3. I do not believe that the needs of wildlife have been considered. Enclosing the Rising Sun Country Park with built up areas will damage the survival of some species. 4. Traffic congestion will be worse than it currently is. The existing roads are bad enough throughout the day especially Whitley Road 5. I do not believe residents have been properly consulted about these decisions. For example, the plans distributed stated that you could only oppose the decision if you suggested an alternative site. 6. As an example of poor planning decision blighting the area, I would cite the new build on Whitley Road. It has blocked out light for Carlton Road and removed the pleasant view that there had been across green areas. These other plans would increase the blight substantially 7. Please leave Benton as it is "" a mixed area with opportunities to exercise and enjoy green areas.</p> | | | <p>delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable.</p> | |
| 893153 | | RESIDENT | LP2015312 | <p>Site 11 now Site E0101: Opposition to the plans to build on the green field sites around Benton I wish to oppose the plans to build on green fields around the Benton area on the following grounds: 1. The area would become entirely built on whereas it is a mixed area at present with buildings and fields. Many people use the foot</p> | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>paths for daily exercise 2. I do not believe that the needs of existing residents have been considered. The green fields are good for well-being. The view over to Gateshead would be lost for ever. 3. I do not believe that the needs of wildlife have been considered. Enclosing the Rising Sun Country Park with built up areas will damage the survival of some species. 4. Traffic congestion will be worse than it currently is. The existing roads are bad enough throughout the day especially Whitley Road 5. I do not believe residents have been properly consulted about these decisions. For example, the plans distributed stated that you could only oppose the decision if you suggested an alternative site. 6. As an example of poor planning decision blighting the area, I would cite the new build on Whitley Road. It has blocked out light for Carlton Road and removed the pleasant view that there had been across green areas. These other plans would increase the blight substantially 7. Please leave Benton as it is "" a mixed area with opportunities to exercise and enjoy green areas.</p> | | | <p>supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable.</p> | |
| 893153 | | RESIDENT | LP2015313 | <p>Site 17:Opposition to the plans to build on the green field sites around Benton I wish to oppose the plans to build on green fields around the Benton area on the following grounds: 1. The area would become entirely built on</p> | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>whereas it is a mixed area at present with buildings and fields. Many people use the foot paths for daily exercise 2. I do not believe that the needs of existing residents have been considered. The green fields are good for well-being. The view over to Gateshead would be lost for ever. 3. I do not believe that the needs of wildlife have been considered. Enclosing the Rising Sun Country Park with built up areas will damage the survival of some species. 4. Traffic congestion will be worse than it currently is. The existing roads are bad enough throughout the day especially Whitley Road 5. I do not believe residents have been properly consulted about these decisions. For example, the plans distributed stated that you could only oppose the decision if you suggested an alternative site. 6. As an example of poor planning decision blighting the area, I would cite the new build on Whitley Road. It has blocked out light for Carlton Road and removed the pleasant view that there had been across green areas. These other plans would increase the blight substantially 7. Please leave Benton as it is "" a mixed area with opportunities to exercise and enjoy green areas.</p> | | | <p>wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable.</p> | |
| 893226 | | RESIDENT | LP2015315 | Site 45: Churchill Avenue I am fiercely opposed to plot 45 being used for more housing! It is an invaluable | Site 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | SMALL piece of green which MANY children play on and it is one of the main reasons I bought my house on Churchill Avenue! Instead of more housing - how about improving the football goals and creating a small park. | | Housing Development Sites | and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. The suggestion of improvements to existing open space will be considered including, if necessary, through the Local Plan process. | |
| 396551 | | RESIDENT | LP2015316 | The Covers, Kings Road South, Wallsend There should be no further extension of the acres / the covers sites off King Road South. | Other | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan does not propose the allocation of any land which would see an extension to the existing completed/permitted developments in this area of Wallsend. Any future planning application would be assessed on individual merit, including in light of Policy DM7.5 (now 4.5) | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 878104 | | RESIDENT | LP2015318 | Site 35-41: I had a petition on your site re 5,500 homes built on green belt land, last year. Over 800 replied and that was without any publicity through the media. Had I put it on facebook or similar I know I would have got a lot more. The 3,000 homes now proposed are STILL far too many for the area in question (Murton/West Monkseaton). The traffic (without the current road works) is always gridlocked at certain times every day and even on so called slack times, it is still very busy along Seatonville and Earsdon Roads. More homes, more traffic and even as you suggest more roads would really | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | cripple the area. It will be a nightmare for car drivers and that is without taking into consideration the environment from fumes etc. I understand the A19 corridor you refer to, but this country is over populated to start with and bringing more up here is spoiling the natural beauty of the area. I'm afraid I cannot support any party that goes along with this (including The Tories), who set the wheels in motion in the first place. | | | accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, the impact which the proposed new link road will have upon the environment, existing residents and communities and the Green Belt will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor | |
| 467684 | | RESIDENT | LP2015320 | Site 35 to 41: I object to Murton - you know what residents think about this desecration of open land already - just | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | read all the objections submitted already. I find the question about alternative locations offensive as it implies everyone accepts the councillors' views that more housing is needed. | | Housing Development Sites | | sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 467684 | | RESIDENT | LP2015321 | Site 22 to 26: I object to Murton - you know what residents think about this desecration of open land already - just read all the objections submitted already. I find the question about alternative locations offensive as it implies everyone accepts the councillors' views that more housing is needed. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 893274 | | RESIDENT | LP2015324 | All site references appear to be appropriate. Development ought to take into consideration effects on public transport and the supply of services e.g. gas, electricity, water etc. Architecturally, ensure that new builds are attractive and desirable. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. The impact that proposed development would have on the transport, infrastructure and utilities network will require assessment on a site-specific basis through the planning process. Where necessary, appropriate improvements will be identified and secured | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | in order for development to be acceptable. The Local Plan includes a range of policies to deliver new development which is attractively designed. | deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 893335 | | RESIDENT | LP2015327 | Site 35 to 41: We would like to object to the proposed new development around Murton Village (sites 35 to 41). The new road, as shown in the Local Plan, linking the Coast Road to the Earsdon by-pass, goes directly over our property. The fact that this road, has been shown on the map, now makes it impossible to sell our property, should we want to. You will appreciate this has had a devastating effect on our lives and we can no longer make plans for the future with this constantly in our thoughts. We attended the meeting at Earsdon Road on Thursday 26 02 2015 but nobody was willing to talk about it. The only answer given was "nothing is set in stone."We do hope North Tyneside Council will have the decency to consult with us, as plans go forward. The proposed new development of 3000 houses will bring in thousands of people, thousands of cars, all trying to use the already congested roads and ever decreasing green spaces, that will be left. The much needed farming land and hedges will disappear and all the wild life with it. We bought our home 23 years ago because we wanted to live in a peaceful area surrounded by green fields and enjoy nature and all the wild | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | life. North Tyneside Council wants to turn this area into a concrete jungle, with nothing left for future generations. It is certainly not a place where we would want to live or bring up a family. | | | to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, the impact which the proposed new link road will have upon the environment, existing residents and communities and the Green Belt will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. | |
| 805325 | | RESIDENT | LP2015328 | Site 35 to 41: We would like to object to the proposed new development around Murton Village (sites 35 to 41). The new road, as shown in the Local Plan, linking the Coast Road to the Earsdon by-pass, goes directly over our property. The fact that this road, has been shown on the map, now makes it impossible to sell our property, should we want to. You will appreciate this has had a devastating effect on our lives and we can no longer make plans for the future with this constantly in our thoughts. We attended the meeting at Earsdon Road on Thursday 26 02 2015 but nobody was willing to talk about it. The only answer given was "nothing is set in stone."We do hope North Tyneside Council will have the decency to consult with us, as plans go forward. The proposed new development of 3000 houses will bring in thousands of people, thousands of cars, all trying to use the already congested roads and ever decreasing green spaces, that will be left. The | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | much needed farming land and hedges will disappear and all the wild life with it. We bought our home 23 years ago because we wanted to live in a peaceful area surrounded by green fields and enjoy nature and all the wild life. North Tyneside Council wants to turn this area into a concrete jungle, with nothing left for future generations. It is certainly not a place where we would want to live or bring up a family. | | | walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, the impact which the proposed new link road will have upon the environment, existing residents and communities and the Green Belt will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. | |
| 589055 | | RESIDENT | LP2015330 | Site 28: Backworth - As a Trustee of Backworth Miners Welfare and President of Backworth Golf Club (member for 43 years) I expressed concern at the proposed development of 590 houses etc on the land at Northumberland Park south of the Golf Course, which regrettably was subsequently granted planning permission. My concerns, were (and still area) damage to the environment to a Green field site (Contrary to Cllr. J. Allen's view that this area was a Brownfield site - not in my experience over 68 years!!). I am further concerned at the possibility of developing further housing on site 28 for the following reasons: 1. This field behind Castle Park Estate has caused flooding problems to Welfare Golf | Site 28 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to flooding and ground conditions and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering matters of flood risk and the overall suitability of the site. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now 7.3)and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>Course for years, despite improvements and regular maintenance to golf course drainage. The existing contours of the land would be an obvious choice for any developer to outfall surface water drainage into the only water course on Welfare land, and subsequently into a currently damaged highway culvert under B1322 (Station Road). Current correspondence between Welfare Manager and North Tyneside Engineers Dept. refers. 2. The additional traffic generated by these two developments would cause more congestion on the B1322, which at peak periods is becoming a "rat run" for traffic trying to avoid Holystone intersection A193/A191 plus the vast increase in traffic emerging from Cobalt Business Park etc. I noted the comments made by Traffic Engineers as to subsequent "possible improvements" to A193 but I am unconvinced at the outcome.</p> | | | <p>for development to be acceptable. This includes improvements to cycling and walking infrastructure, integral to any proposal, and ensuring safe access.</p> | |
| 589055 | | RESIDENT | LP2015331 | <p>Site 35 to 41: Rake Lane and Seatonville Road. I note this area has been earmarked for the possible development of 2000 homes subject to the conditions noted in the plan. A great concern for both current and future generations who live in adjacent areas of Preston Grange, Preston Farm, Chirton Grange, West Monkseaton, has to be, despite current drainage work on the A192 at Wellfield/West</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | Monkseaton, the increase of possible future flooding, and substantial increase in traffic, in an area where traffic has increased substantially over the last 40 years. | | | and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing improvement works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 893576 | | RESIDENT | LP2015332 | Site 45: Strongly object - this is the only green space in a large estate. Used daily by dog walkers and children playing. Could affect the residents of Charlton Court. | Site 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. The scope of the proposal does not relate to the existing sheltered housing units and would represent additional units on adjacent land. | No amendments proposed. |
| 604691 | | RESIDENT | LP2015334 | Site 17: I see there might be houses going to be put on this land. Both areas 17, 18 are going to be a lot of houses, | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | it will be too many so I am opposing against 17. It is about the wildlife, the health of everybody around, because the cars, vans and any other persons on the road and new roads. The environment will be damaged and the area will not be healthy for pedestrians, cycles and other things to walk around there as it has been for the last 100 years. Now more and more houses. | | Housing Development Sites | Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer would have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now 7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 893592 | | RESIDENT | LP2015335 | Site 17: (and over the A186) - More houses will only exacerbate the problem. Develop brownfield sites. Re site next to A186 - how is this a consultation? Already digging up another field. Traffic horrendous into town via Four Lane Ends also via Wallsend, Coast Road. Completely | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer would have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | opposed to these sites: - building on beautiful countryside; - traffic issues, ill thought through; - pressure on services i.e. GP surgeries etc.. Not that my views will be considered! | | | between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now 7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The importance of community services, including GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 893594 | | RESIDENT | LP2015336 | Site 39 to 41: The land to the east of Murton Village, between the rear of Sherwood and West Monkseaton, is highly unstable. Having lived here over | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | 50 years I have watched the contours of these fields change frequently. Flooding takes place at various locations during heavy rains. The ideal use for this land in my opinion would be forestry and nature reserve. | | Development Sites | coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing improvement works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 396890 | | RESIDENT | LP2015339 | New site: The land at the corner of Station Road and Front Street, Camperdown is to be included for the development of bungalows (SHLAA Site 428) | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Suggestion noted. This is a small site with a capacity of less than 5 units, which has not been considered for allocation through the Local Plan process. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site- | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developabilit |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now 4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. Identification in the SHLAA (Site 428) ensures this will be included as part of delivery in broad area allowance. | y of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 396890 | | RESIDENT | LP2015340 | New site: The field adjacent to Means Drive, Burradon is to be included for housing development. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 814591 | | | LP2015341 | Well, like all other contributors to date my concerns are that the deals may already be made to build on more and more of the green sites. I don't know that the wildlife will understand that they are to use ever shrinking designated corridors and that we may see more and more 'road kill' than at present. Could the new housing (I appreciate people need to live somewhere), not be on remaining brown sites and when they are all absolutely full THEN consider the old farm fields? | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 794139 | | RESIDENT | LP2015350 | Site 35 to 41: object to development on these plots. Building a new town near Murton will destroy the character of the area. Green land / fields should never be built on while brownfield sites are available. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | and retain individual character and identity. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 893847 | | | LP2015353 | Site 142: I object to the development of the greenfield site at Burradon Road/ Front Street, Annitsford (site 142) for housing. Development of this site would be harmful to the open and semi-rural character of the village, when approached from the North. Annitsford has been significantly expanded in the past 30 years, particularly on the east side of Front Street and I consider that there is no need to develop this small greenfield site when there are plans to develop the greenfield Annitsford Farm site (site 3) with 400 houses. Site 142 is also close to the A189 Spine Road and Moor Farm roundabout and would be susceptible to traffic noise. | Site 142 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The proposed delivery from both Site 142 and Site 3 is currently forecast to contribute towards meeting overall requirement for new homes in the borough. Following further assessment, if this site is no longer deemed suitable, an alternative will have to be identified to make up this shortfall. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|--------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | This site has been selected as a suggested allocation following this process but any proposal for development will require a formal planning application, with the issues of visual, landscape and environmental impact having to be assessed and, if necessary, measures proposed to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 893850 | | | LP2015355 | I appreciate that not all your preferred sites will eventually be built on; and so I am really anxious to know that the final plan will spread the load of new housing construction equitably around the borough, hopefully taking the needs of established residential areas as much into consideration as any other factor, and ensuring that no-one has to live in a large permanent construction site for the next ten or fifteen years. | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now 7.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. The Publication Local Plan, the next stage, will include the preferred range of sites for allocation. Conditions related to each specific planning permission will be imposed in order to control and mitigate the potential impacts of the construction process. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 893850 | | | LP2015357 | Site 14: I am really glad to see that you have "not included" two sites in the heart of the Benton Conservation Area as part of this of the local plan - the site at the "Benton Triangle" owned by | Site 14 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | Nexus, and the "Benton Curve" owned by Newcastle Airport. I hope you will be able to make a refusal of planning permission stick, if the designation of "Conservation Area" has any meaning. Particularly as we are almost certain to lose large areas of open space, these few small remaining wildlife havens become increasingly important. | | Sites | exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | |
| 893850 | | | LP2015358 | Site 128: I am really glad to see that you have "not included" two sites in the heart of the Benton Conservation Area as part of this of the local plan - the site at the "Benton Triangle" owned by Nexus, and the "Benton Curve" owned by Newcastle Airport. I hope you will be able to make a refusal of planning permission stick, if the designation of "Conservation Area" has any meaning. Particularly as we are almost certain to lose large areas of open space, these few small remaining wildlife havens become increasingly important. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893850 | | | LP2015359 | Site 11 now Site E0101: It would be reassuring also if sites 111 and 139 (East Benton Farm, and Darsley Park) could be preserved as open space. There are developments apart from housing which could benefit a growing community - for example, there is a high demand for allotments in the borough as you know. Woodland, tennis courts, parkland, grazing land - these are all useful amenities! | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. Opportunities to incorporate open space, landscaping and community uses, including allotments, will be explored on a site-specific basis, taking account of the latest | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | evidence of need. | |
| 893850 | | | LP2015360 | Site 139: It would be reassuring also if sites 111 and 139 (East Benton Farm, and Darsley Park) could be preserved as open space. There are developments apart from housing which could benefit a growing community - for example, there is a high demand for allotments in the borough as you know. Woodland, tennis courts, parkland, grazing land - these are all useful amenities! | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. Opportunities to incorporate open space, landscaping and community uses, including allotments, will be explored on a site-specific basis, taking account of the latest evidence of need. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893850 | | | LP2015361 | Site 17: It is not very encouraging to see that, even where North Tyneside has refused planning permission (on the east Station Road greenfield site adjacent to the Rising Sun Park) the developer, Persimmon, have had the refusal overturned by a national body. So they will also presumably build on the fields to the west of Station Road as well. Persimmon's track record in the north east is worrying; last autumn Gateshead Council halted their work at a development because they were not adhering to planning regulations; and a small site in Wallsend has also been the subject of complaints to do with drainage/sewerage, and remains uncompleted after EIGHT YEARS. Their plans for mitigating the impact of so much building on the natural environment seem good on paper, but | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | there must be doubts as to whether they will amount to anything in reality. I am really most concerned about the impact of so much housing development on traffic congestion, noise, and pollution in a small area of Benton. I see that the total of all your preferred sites for housing, just in the land along Whitley Road from Asda to Four Lane Ends, amounts to 1,824 new houses, in addition to those already under construction around the Blue Flames land. I would like to see some serious report on the possible impact of so much additional traffic on this area; Four Lane Ends is already a major choke point for east-west traffic. The loss of open green space is also a very sad factor in this area; some thinking about damage limitation would be very welcome. | | | assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | |
| 893885 | | RESIDENT | LP2015362 | Site 35 to 41: Object to farmland in preference to brownfield, would remove last green area and susceptibility to flooding. Demand for 15,000 yet to be proved and will preference be given to locals. Opposed to development. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing improvement works. An application for development will have to be | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | detailed masterplanning. |
| 893885 | | RESIDENT | LP2015363 | New site: alternative locations should be any site (brownfield) with planning permission - but not greenfields that are forever lost to food production and prone to flood. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | All sites with an outstanding planning permission are currently forecast to contribute towards meeting overall requirement for 16,632 new homes in the borough over the plan period. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 893889 | | RESIDENT | LP2015365 | Site 11 now Site E0108: Plenty opportunities for building at the other locations on map. Strongly oppose building for the following reasons: 1. The main road was raised some time ago by the council so that the road could be widened and our house is now 2 steps down from the road. The grass opposite offers good drainage in an area that has suffered flooding | Site 11 now Site E0108 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to flooding and ground conditions and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>previously. If that area is built on there would be nowhere for the water to go except down to our house. 2. We previously opposed to the moving of the bus stop from the east end of Western Terrace but it was moved anyway because it was in front of a house. If houses are built it will once again be in front of a house and the new residents will no doubt park outside of our houses creating a parking issue. 3. If the houses are in the same style as the houses already on Western Terrace then why build more when there are 2 for sale which have remained unsold for well over a year or longer. 4. Angerton Terrace was build when Dudley was a mining village and there is a strong possibility that there is underground mines under the houses. Our house already moves when large vehicles go past, digging foundations opposite could seriously damage our foundations or disturb old mine workings. 5. We bought this house with an open aspect as the main purchase reason. We don't want to love on a housing estate staring at a brick wall. If houses are built opposite it will seriously lower our standard of life and go against the main reason for wanting to live here. This was a village not a new town and we hate what is happening to it. It seems that there are numerous locations on the plans in the area for large scale building (much to</p> | | | <p>The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable - this includes acceptable resolution of any parking issues.</p> <p>The suggestion of improvements to existing open space will be considered including, if necessary, through the Local Plan process. Opportunities to develop new allotment sites will be explored on a site-specific basis, taking account of the latest evidence of need.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | our dismay) so please for the sake of 14 houses can that tiny bit of grass be left alone or put to another use e.g. play park, allotments. | | | | |
| 893912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015368 | Site 3, Annitsford Farm - objection. I am concerned about the proposed development in Dudley / Annitsford for 400 houses. Will the access to the estate come from the Wyndings via Front Street in Annitsford. This is totally unsuitable for 400+ cars and would be very noisy for Wynding residents. Also the infrastructure in Dudley is not good enough for the increase in population. | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For Annitsford Fm, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 893922 | | RESIDENT | LP2015370 | Site 128: We would like to make know that we do now wish any building to be done on the disused railway adjoining the Oval and North Avenue; and it should be retained as a wildlife corridor. The traffic is increasing all the time in this area, and attempts to stop the rat running between Thornhill Road and Grange Avenue are unsuccessful. We find this particularly dangerous as most houses have at least one car parked on the road, so that in some parts footpaths are inaccessible. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In the current of the Local Plan this site is not proposed as a suggested allocation for development. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893926 | | RESIDENT | LP2015372 | Site 128: I have received a copy of the recent North Tyneside council plan and would ask you to register my strong | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | support for your designation of the Benton Curve disused railway as a wildlife corridor. | | Housing Development Sites | of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | |
| 893928 | | RESIDENT | LP2015373 | Site 128: We strongly support designation of 'Benton curve' as wildlife corridor. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893932 | | RESIDENT | LP2015375 | Site 128: I strongly support the designation of the Benton curve as a wildlife corridor. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893941 | | RESIDENT | LP2015376 | Site 128: I strongly support the designation of the Benton curve as a wildlife corridor. I have lived at the following address for 57 years and many many years ago I agreed for the same thing to happen to the curve but nothing came of it until now, thank you. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893944 | | RESIDENT | LP2015378 | Site 128: I strongly support the designation of Benton curve as a wildlife corridor. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | as open space. | |
| 893964 | | RESIDENT | LP2015380 | Site 128: I am emailing to record my strong support for the local authority's intention to designate the Benton Curve, a section of disused railway adjoining The Oval in Benton, as a wildlife corridor. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893933 | | RESIDENT | LP2015382 | Site 128: I strongly support of the designation of the above disused railway line [Disused railway adjoining The Oval and North Avenue Benton] known as Benton Curve as a wildlife corridor. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894055 | | RESIDENT | LP2015386 | Site 128: I strongly support the designation of the Benton curve as a wildlife corridor. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894270 | | RESIDENT | LP2015387 | We wish to register our concern about the amount of green field land being given over to housing use in North Tyneside. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 894349 | | RESIDENT | LP2015389 | Site 128: strongly support the designation of the Benton Curve as a wildlife corridor. We think it is important for the area as a whole. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015392 | | | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | No response necessary. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015393 | Site 11 now Site E0101: Although it would appear to be too late to save some of the green fields stretching along Whitley Road from Asda to Darsley Park I object to any further development on the fields that have not already been given full planning permission. All these fields should have been considered as, and indeed are shown on the map as a natural wildlife corridor /extension of the Rising Sun Country Park ,an area which was created for that very purpose by North Tyneside Council. A success story that they themselves herald and advertise as one of the "Jewels in the Crown" of North Tyneside ,and yet now seem to be restricting in its natural wildlife | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | benefits. If these fields are built on then there will not be any effective "buffer zone " between existing communities such as Benton and Wallsend. The volume of traffic existing on Whitley Road is already more than it can cope with without further residential development. If any land should be given over to residential development then it should be the area covered by the ramshackle collection of so called industrial units known as the "Trembles Garage" industrial site on Whitley Road. | | | The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The brownfield element of this site, Trembles Yard, is currently occupied for employment purposes. Any proposal for redevelopment of this site would be considered through the planning process and assessed on merit, including the need to retain this land for employment purposes to meet future economic growth forecasts. | |
| 894375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015394 | Site 139: Although it would appear to be too late to save some of the green fields stretching along Whitley Road from Asda to Darsley Park I object to any further development on the fields that have not already been given full planning permission. All these fields should have been considered as, and indeed are shown on the map as a natural wildlife corridor /extension of the Rising Sun Country Park ,an area which was created for that very purpose by North Tyneside Council. A success story that they themselves herald and advertise as one of the | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | "Jewels in the Crown" of North Tyneside ,and yet now seem to be restricting in its natural wildlife benefits. If these fields are built on then there will not be any effective "buffer zone " between existing communities such as Benton and Wallsend. The volume of traffic existing on Whitley Road is already more than it can cope with without further residential development. If any land should be given over to residential development then it should be the area covered by the ramshackle collection of so called industrial units known as the "Trembles Garage" industrial site on Whitley Road. | | | tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S10.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The brownfield element of this site, Trembles Yard, is currently occupied for employment purposes. Any proposal for redevelopment of this site would be considered through the planning process and assessed on merit, including the need to retain this land for employment purposes to meet future economic growth forecasts. | |
| 594611 | National Grid | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015400 | Site 30: Land at Backworth Metro, Shiremoor crossed by ZZA 275 kV overhead line. National Grid does not own the land over which the overhead lines cross, and it obtains the rights from individual landowners to place our equipment on their land. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ. Because of the scale, bulk and cost of the transmission equipment | Site 30 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Comments noted. The detailed design and layout of a potential development scheme will take into account the need to maintain access to overhead lines. Opportunities to incorporate open space, landscaping or parking etc. will be encourage and explored on a site-specific basis. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>required to operate at 400kV National Grid only supports proposals for the relocation of existing high voltage overhead lines where such proposals directly facilitate a major development or infrastructure project of national importance which has been identified as such by central government. Therefore we advise developers and planning authorities to take into account the location and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment when planning developments. National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. This is for two reasons, the amenity of potential occupiers of properties in the vicinity of lines and because National Grid needs quick and easy access to carry out maintenance of its equipment to ensure that it can be returned to service and be available as part of the national transmission system. Such access can be difficult to obtain without inconveniencing and disturbing occupiers and residents, particularly where properties are in close proximity to overhead lines. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. To comply with statutory safety clearances the live electricity conductors of National Grid's overhead power lines are designed to</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>be a minimum height above ground. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site. National Grid seeks to encourage high quality and well planned development in the vicinity of its high voltage overhead lines. Land beneath and adjacent to the overhead line route should be used to make a positive contribution to the development of the site and can for example be used for nature conservation, open space, landscaping areas or used as a parking court. National Grid, in association with David Lock Associates has produced "A Sense of Place"™ guidelines, which look at how to create high quality development near overhead lines and offers practical solutions which can assist in avoiding the unnecessary sterilisation of land in the vicinity of high voltage overhead lines. "A Sense of Place"™ is available from National Grid and can be viewed at: http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Senseofplace/Download/ Further information regarding development near overhead lines and substations is</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | available here: http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohl_final/pdf/brochure.htm | | | | |
| 594611 | National Grid | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015401 | Site 34: Plot 11, Cobalt Business Park crossed by ZZA 275 kV overhead line. National Grid does not own the land over which the overhead lines cross, and it obtains the rights from individual landowners to place our equipment on their land. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ. Because of the scale, bulk and cost of the transmission equipment required to operate at 400kV National Grid only supports proposals for the relocation of existing high voltage overhead lines where such proposals directly facilitate a major development or infrastructure project of national importance which has been identified as such by central government. Therefore we advise developers and planning authorities to take into account the location and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment when planning developments. National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. This is for two reasons, the amenity of potential occupiers of properties in the vicinity of lines and because National Grid needs quick and easy access to carry | Site 34 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (part NT030). Comments noted. The detailed design and layout of a potential development scheme will take into account the need to maintain access to overhead lines. Opportunities to incorporate open space, landscaping or parking etc. will be encourage and explored on a site-specific basis. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>out maintenance of its equipment to ensure that it can be returned to service and be available as part of the national transmission system. Such access can be difficult to obtain without inconveniencing and disturbing occupiers and residents, particularly where properties are in close proximity to overhead lines. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. To comply with statutory safety clearances the live electricity conductors of National Grid's overhead power lines are designed to be a minimum height above ground. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site. National Grid seeks to encourage high quality and well planned development in the vicinity of its high voltage overhead lines. Land beneath and adjacent to the overhead line route should be used to make a positive contribution to the development of the site and can for example be used for nature conservation, open space, landscaping</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>areas or used as a parking court.</p> <p>National Grid, in association with David Lock Associates has produced "A Sense of Place"™ guidelines, which look at how to create high quality development near overhead lines and offers practical solutions which can assist in avoiding the unnecessary sterilisation of land in the vicinity of high voltage overhead lines. "A Sense of Place"™ is available from National Grid and can be viewed at: http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Senseofplace/Download/ Further information regarding development near overhead lines and substations is available here: http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohl_final/pdf/brochure.htm</p> | | | | |
| 594611 | National Grid | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015402 | <p>Site 106: - Tune Tunnel Trading Estate, High Flatworth crossed by ZZA 275 kV overhead line National Grid does not own the land over which the overhead lines cross, and it obtains the rights from individual landowners to place our equipment on their land. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ. Because of the scale, bulk and cost of the transmission equipment required to operate at 400kV National Grid only supports proposals for the relocation of existing high voltage overhead lines where such proposals</p> | Site 106 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT001).</p> <p>Comments noted. The detailed design and layout of a potential development scheme will take into account the need to maintain access to overhead lines. Opportunities to incorporate open space, landscaping or parking etc. will be encouraged and explored on a site-specific basis.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>directly facilitate a major development or infrastructure project of national importance which has been identified as such by central government. Therefore we advise developers and planning authorities to take into account the location and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment when planning developments. National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. This is for two reasons, the amenity of potential occupiers of properties in the vicinity of lines and because National Grid needs quick and easy access to carry out maintenance of its equipment to ensure that it can be returned to service and be available as part of the national transmission system. Such access can be difficult to obtain without inconveniencing and disturbing occupiers and residents, particularly where properties are in close proximity to overhead lines. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. To comply with statutory safety clearances the live electricity conductors of National Grid's overhead power lines are designed to be a minimum height above ground. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site. National Grid seeks to encourage high quality and well planned development in the vicinity of its high voltage overhead lines. Land beneath and adjacent to the overhead line route should be used to make a positive contribution to the development of the site and can for example be used for nature conservation, open space, landscaping areas or used as a parking court. National Grid, in association with David Lock Associates has produced "A Sense of Place" guidelines, which look at how to create high quality development near overhead lines and offers practical solutions which can assist in avoiding the unnecessary sterilisation of land in the vicinity of high voltage overhead lines. "A Sense of Place" is available from National Grid and can be viewed at: http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Senseofplace/Download/ Further information regarding development near overhead lines and substations is available here: http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohl_final/pdf/brochure.htm</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| 594611 | National Grid | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015403 | <p>Site 108: "" Esso, Howdon Road, East Howdon crossed by ZZA 275 kV overhead line National Grid does not own the land over which the overhead lines cross, and it obtains the rights from individual landowners to place our equipment on their land. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ. Because of the scale, bulk and cost of the transmission equipment required to operate at 400kV National Grid only supports proposals for the relocation of existing high voltage overhead lines where such proposals directly facilitate a major development or infrastructure project of national importance which has been identified as such by central government. Therefore we advise developers and planning authorities to take into account the location and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment when planning developments. National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. This is for two reasons, the amenity of potential occupiers of properties in the vicinity of lines and because National Grid needs quick and easy access to carry out maintenance of its equipment to ensure that it can be returned to service and be available as part of the national transmission system. Such</p> | Site 108 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT053). Comments noted. The detailed design and layout of a potential development scheme will take into account the need to maintain access to overhead lines. Opportunities to incorporate open space, landscaping or parking etc. will be encourage and explored on a site-specific basis.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>access can be difficult to obtain without inconveniencing and disturbing occupiers and residents, particularly where properties are in close proximity to overhead lines. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. To comply with statutory safety clearances the live electricity conductors of National Grid's overhead power lines are designed to be a minimum height above ground. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site. National Grid seeks to encourage high quality and well planned development in the vicinity of its high voltage overhead lines. Land beneath and adjacent to the overhead line route should be used to make a positive contribution to the development of the site and can for example be used for nature conservation, open space, landscaping areas or used as a parking court. National Grid, in association with David Lock Associates has produced "A Sense of Place"™ guidelines, which</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>look at how to create high quality development near overhead lines and offers practical solutions which can assist in avoiding the unnecessary sterilisation of land in the vicinity of high voltage overhead lines. "A Sense of Place™ is available from National Grid and can be viewed at: http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Senseofplace/Download/ Further information regarding development near overhead lines and substations is available here: http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohl_final/pdf/brochure.htm</p> | | | | |
| 396930 | | RESIDENT | LP2015408 | <p>Site 35 to 41: apart from the negative aesthetic reasons of "concreting over the countryside" we have to consider the retention of farmland for food security. Also this area should be in a green belt area to preserve wildlife and to differentiate the urban areas of Monkseaton and Shiremoor.</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>character and identity.</p> <p>Any change to the Green Belt, both addition and deletion, must be proposed through the Local Plan process. In line with NPPF, in order to make such a change exceptional circumstances must be identified. A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to support the Local Plan and this concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>The Local Plan does not have any direct influence over the link between where food is produced and where it is consumed. However the importance of agricultural land in creating a sustainable future is recognised and the retention of the current Green Belt boundaries will ensure that significant tracts of productive agricultural land are protected from development over the plan period and beyond. Further evidence relating to agricultural land classification within the borough has been requested from Natural England.</p> | |
| 894600 | | | LP2015410 | The quantity of housing proposed at Benton is too large. The aim should be to retain this valuable green space. The traffic issues along Whitley Road are well know and to add further housing to this congested area cannot be for the good of the borough or any residents. To have so much area designated as housing is the thin end of the wedge and once one part gets permission then the president will | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | have been set and before long all the green space will be gone and all the green space will be unrecoverable. | | | <p>and appropriate allocations are selected. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> | |
| 893914 | | RESIDENT | LP2015412 | Site 139: I am against the proposals to put houses on the fields numbered 139 and 17 on that plan. Just as there | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | needs to be a green break between Killingworth and Forest Hall, so there needs to be one between Forest Hall and Wallsend. | | Housing Development Sites | Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | |
| 893914 | | RESIDENT | LP2015413 | Site 17: I am against the proposals to put houses on the fields numbered 139 and 17 on that plan. Just as there needs to be a green break between Killingworth and Forest Hall, so there needs to be one between Forest Hall and Wallsend. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 894634 | | RESIDENT | LP2015430 | Site 128: I have lived at 10 The Oval, Benton for 50 years and my house is directly opposite the disused railway line. I was extremely happy to learn that there was potential for the re-designation of the Benton Curve as a wildlife corridor. In this day and age of housing etc it is refreshing to think that the council would like to designate this land in this way. Any other development of this land was be hugely disruptive and in my view totally unacceptable. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 444906 | | RESIDENT | LP2015432 | Site 61: The short-stay car park is heavily used by people shopping in | Site 61 | S 7.3 Distribution of | The Council is keen to promote the reuse of brownfield land in town centres and the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | Shields. IT would be better used as housing but after careful re-provision of parking (and parking for new residents!) | | Potential Housing Development Sites | Local Plan looks to focus development within the main urban area. However, the need to deliver new homes is not looked at in isolation and Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) aims to pursue growth and regeneration of town centres by delivering new development, but only when this is appropriate and not detrimental to existing circumstances. One priority of this policy is to enhance accessibility by all modes of transport and any proposals which would result in the loss of existing car parking would have to be carefully considered through the planning process, including the resulting impact on existing shopping and community facilities. The Council also has a Parking Strategy which aims to manage the provision of parking in the borough which will provide further guidance. | |
| 444906 | | RESIDENT | LP2015433 | Site 56: The Ice Factory Foreman's House SHOULD BE RETAINED as a heritage asset. | Site 56 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Comment noted. In accordance with our Heritage Assets policies, due consideration will be given to the protection and enhancement of heritage assets in the development process. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894716 | | RESIDENT | LP2015435 | Eric Pickles says that brownfield sites should have priority over greenfield - therefore redevelop 993 homes (NTC Plan p.87, 7.83) classed as long-term vacant and 3.3% of total housing stock classed as vacant. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>The role that long-term empty homes can play in providing additional housing is identified through the Local Plan and Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) includes the objective to bring empty homes back into use. An allowance for windfall development is made through the Local Plan, based on past trends and evidenced through the SHLAA, which provides a small proportion of the total housing requirement to 2032. This windfall allowance includes supply from bringing empty/vacant homes back into use.</p> | |
| 894716 | | RESIDENT | LP2015436 | <p>Site 35 to 41: Concerned about: 1. Major negative impact of housing on the site, especially regard to: medieval settlement and loss of rural setting. 2. Impact of road through site to Earsdon through greenfield and Green Belt. 3. Impact of considerably increased traffic volume as a result of housing development and associated social infrastructure. 4. Issues concerning flooding, wildlife, ecology and detrimental impact to surrounding existing urban areas should housing on the scale proposed proceed. 5. Need to protect the rural identity of Murton Village. 6. Need to protect wildlife corridor and enhance. 7. Consider providing improved habitats for wildlife to make attractive recreation area for local residents, e.g. woodland, hedgerows, bike trail - incorporating</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity.</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | medieval remains/settlement to attract tourists (from Coast-to-Sege-dunum, e.g. cyclists and Sustrans). There's money to be made from tourists! | | | As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, the impact which the proposed new link road will have upon the Green Belt will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. | |
| 444924 | | RESIDENT | LP2015440 | Site 35 to 41: why not move 'Green Belt' to run along edge of existing housing in Monkseaton South to reduce the impact on existing householders? It would seem fairer to do this. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Any change to the Green Belt, both addition and deletion, must be proposed through the Local Plan process. In line with NPPF, in order to make such a change exceptional circumstances must be identified. A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to support the Local Plan and this concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | |
| 894071 | | | LP2015451 | Please perform a thorough, detailed review, assessment of North Tyneside and identify all brownfield sites, council land, council buildings/properties and prioritise these as housing development sites. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Each year the Council undertakes such a review through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), an assessment which identifies sites which are potentially suitable and developable for housing. The latest includes over 480 sites spread across the borough with an annual review of brownfield sites and Council-owned land a priority through the methodology.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the</p> | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 894071 | | | LP2015452 | Site 52: Land at Shap Road. This land has been an open and safe, play space for children since the 1950's and is used as such today. Please do not develop this site for housing. Instead initiate housing development at Bolam Avenue/Grove play area and all brownfield sites, council owned land, council property/buildings within North Tyneside as the first priority. | Site 52 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Each year the Council undertakes a review of potentially suitable and developable for housing sites through the SHLAA, with identification of brownfield sites and Council-owned land a priority.</p> <p>Suggested noted. If meeting the site threshold, this site will be included in the next review of the SHLAA in order to be assessed for suitability and ultimately</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | deliverability/developability for housing. | |
| 894903 | | RESIDENT | LP2015454 | Site 22 to 26: These seem sensible. Will additional Metro stations be provided to improve transport? | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The Council currently working with Nexus in order to identify the improvements to the public transport network necessary to deliver the Local Plan, this includes opportunities for potential Metro extensions and new stations. Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) sets out the overall strategic approach to transport improvements. As part of the Masterplan for both Killingworth Moor, an access and transport strategy will be necessary, and part of the work for this will include the consideration of the need for an additional Metro station, taking account of need and demand but also being aware of the wider operational requirements of the system. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 894903 | | RESIDENT | LP2015455 | Site 27: These seem sensible. Will additional Metro stations be provided to improve transport? | Site 27 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The Council currently working with Nexus in order to identify the improvements to the public transport network necessary to deliver the Local Plan, this includes opportunities for potential Metro extensions and new stations. Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) sets out the overall | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | strategic approach to transport improvements. | |
| 894903 | | RESIDENT | LP2015456 | Site 35 to 41: These seem sensible. Will additional Metro stations be provided to improve transport? | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The Council currently working with Nexus in order to identify the improvements to the public transport network necessary to deliver the Local Plan, this includes opportunities for potential Metro extensions and new stations. Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) sets out the overall strategic approach to transport improvements, with specific proposals for this strategic site to be identified through the Masterplan. As part of the Masterplan for both Murton, an access and transport strategy will be necessary, and part of the work for this will include the consideration of the need for an additional Metro station, taking account of need and demand but also being aware of the wider operational requirements of the system. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 894903 | | RESIDENT | LP2015457 | Site 50: It is important to use infill sites such as these in Whitley Bay. Please use as many as possible to provide new housing, well integrated with existing houses. | Site 50 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894903 | | RESIDENT | LP2015458 | Site 51: It is important to use infill sites such as these in Whitley Bay. Please use as many as possible to provide new housing, well integrated with existing | Site 51 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | Support noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | houses. | | Development Sites | S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | |
| 894903 | | RESIDENT | LP2015459 | Site 138: It is important to use infill sites such as these in Whitley Bay. Please use as many as possible to provide new housing, well integrated with existing houses. | Site 138 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894903 | | RESIDENT | LP2015460 | Site 48: It is important to use infill sites such as these in Whitley Bay. Please use as many as possible to provide new housing, well integrated with existing houses. | Site 48 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894903 | | RESIDENT | LP2015461 | Site 123: It is important to use infill sites such as these in Whitley Bay. Please use as many as possible to provide new housing, well integrated with existing houses. | Site 123 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 806166 | | RESIDENT | LP2015479 | Site 11 now Site E010: I am writing to object strongly to the North Tyneside Local Plan for the following reasons: "c Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example Site 11 now Site E010 contains a Site of Local Wildlife Interest, | Site 11 now Site E010 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT031). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial designation as a SLCI does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| 806166 | | RESIDENT | LP2015480 | Site 109: I am writing to object strongly to the North Tyneside Local Plan for the following reasons: "ç Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example site 109 is located on a wildlife corridor. | Site 109 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT058). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 895166 | St Columba's United Reformed Church | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015483 | Site 61: I am writing to you with concerns of the plans which are being exhibited in the North Shields Library in relation to item 61 of the Development Plan of Stephenson House, Unicorn House and the Norfolk Street Car Park. The first two buildings being removed for redevelopment of this area I support but taking away the Norfolk Street Car Park would be a definite disadvantage to North Shields, so I am adamantly against this being redeveloped. This facility | Site 61 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Partial support for redevelopment noted. The Council is keen to promote the reuse of brownfield land in town centres and the Local Plan looks to focus development within the main urban area. However, the need to deliver new homes is not looked at in isolation and Policy S6.1 aims to pursue growth and regeneration of town centres by delivering new development, but only when this is appropriate and not detrimental to existing circumstances. One priority of this policy is to enhance accessibility by all modes of transport and any proposals which | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>accommodates so many people, in particular I write in relation to St Columba's United Reformed Church which stands on the corner of Northumberland Square and Norfolk Street. This Church serves the community in a variety of ways from Parent and Toddlers, Disability Groups, the elderly and numerous Church related activities, so the loss of the Norfolk Street Car Park would be a great disadvantage to so many people. The Car Park is also very popular for people shopping in North Shields, for the many Business in the vicinity, surely you wish to encourage them the future of the Town. Car parking is difficult at the best of times so I do hope you will take my comments into consideration and serve all of the people in the best way possible.</p> | | | <p>would result in the loss of existing car parking would have to be carefully considered through the planning process, including the resulting impact on existing shopping and community facilities, such as St Columba's URC.</p> <p>The Council also has a Parking Strategy which aims to manage the provision of parking in the borough which will provide further guidance.</p> | |
| 801358 | | RESIDENT | LP2015485 | <p>Site 35 to 41: I bought my house because I liked the quiet disposition it enjoyed. It's now like living on the M1, thanks largely to the building of Friars Rise Flats, 3 new properties on Cauldwell Ave and an estate, Briar Vale. My greatest concern is traffic on Cauldwell Ave, bearing in mind there is also a school to consider. Where is the food currently grown on this site going to be grown in future?</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. The Local Plan does not have any direct influence over the link between where food is produced and where it is consumed. However the importance of agricultural land in creating a sustainable future is recognised and the retention of the current Green Belt boundaries will ensure that significant tracts of productive agricultural land are protected from development over the plan period and beyond. Further evidence relating to agricultural land classification within the borough has been requested from Natural England. | detailed masterplanning. |
| 801358 | | RESIDENT | LP2015487 | New site: Whitley Bay Golf Course - it's a waste of space! | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015492 | Site 22-26: The LPA should be planning positively for biodiversity, seeking net gain and producing a coherent and functioning wildlife corridor network. Many of the current allocations for development, such as sites 22-26, 35-41 and 109 do not meet this and will ultimately result in a net loss of biodiversity with fragmented small | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | areas of habitat, not linked by a workable network of wildlife corridors. Furthermore, NWT consider that the LPA are not planning positively for biodiversity and not meeting the requirements of NNPF by failing to produce a strategic map of identified areas for biodiversity off-setting, mitigation, compensation and wildlife habitat creation. Indeed NWT has met with Council representatives and proposed this prior to the publication of this and this has not been included. | | | the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015494 | Sites 35-41: The LPA should be planning positively for biodiversity, seeking net gain and producing a coherent and functioning wildlife corridor network. Many of the current allocations for development, such as sites 22-26, 35-41 and 109 do not meet this and will ultimately result in a net loss of biodiversity with fragmented small areas of habitat, not linked by a workable network of wildlife corridors. Furthermore, NWT consider that the LPA are not planning positively for biodiversity and not meeting the requirements of NNPF by failing to produce a strategic map of identified areas for biodiversity off-setting, mitigation, compensation and wildlife habitat creation. Indeed NWT has met with Council representatives and proposed this prior to the publication of this and this has not been included. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| 895180 | | RESIDENT | LP2015513 | Site 52: object to housing - on Marden need to leave green space. | Site 52 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. | No amendments proposed. |
| 895180 | | RESIDENT | LP2015518 | Site 70: houses to be built in Lawson St - it is a very industrial zone, it should be kept that way. Area is not desirable for housing. | Site 70 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site has been identified and assessed through the SHLAA as developable in the medium/longer term for housing development and identified as suggested allocation through the Local Plan. The proposal has also been made in light of the future need for employment land in the borough and consideration of the most appropriate sites to retain for this use. The proposed allocation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage change and an application for development will need to consider requirements of existing businesses. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805343 | | RESIDENT | LP2015519 | Site 35 to 41: I strongly object to the building on this site due to: 1) current levels of congestion leaving the Whitley Bay area especially on the main routes via Earsdon and New York. This has already been exacerbated by the new houses and traffic lights at West Park. 2) Strain on facilities such as first and middle schools, doctors and hospitals in local area. 3) This is the only green belt area within close proximity to the coast and is used for | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | | recreation by many local residents. 4) More appropriate sites include area surrounding Wideopen, Dudley and Killingworth. These areas are close to a main trunk road i.e. A19, so no access issues. | | | <p>appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity.</p> <p>The importance of community services is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. The need for additional services and facilities, as part of the Murton site, will be looked at as part of the Masterplan process, with consideration of need for access to education and healthcare being key priorities in the overall delivery of the site.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> | of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor.</p> <p>Much of the open land around Wideopen, Dudley and Killingworth is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period.</p> | |
| 805343 | | RESIDENT | LP2015520 | New site: More appropriate sites (rather than Murton) include area surrounding Wideopen, Dudley and Killingworth. These areas are close to a main trunk road i.e. A19, so no access issues. | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3, reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected.</p> <p>Much of the open land around Wideopen, Dudley and Killingworth is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no</p> | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | |
| 895338 | | RESIDENT | LP2015523 | Site 35 to 41: object to housing at Murton. 1) Traffic - the road past Rake Lane Hospital cannot hold any additional traffic at peak times. The majority of this traffic goes from Monkseaton/Whitley Bay to the west, so a new road towards Earsdon would not help this. 2) Flooding - the map shows the clear reason why this land has not been built on before - the streams! It seems like we want to increase flooding in the borough and already residential areas. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor.</p> <p>The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing improvement works. An application for development will have to be</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 895338 | | RESIDENT | LP2015524 | New site: I believe the population of North Tyneside should be spread out and therefore land further north of Backworth and around Dudley should be used where there is more space and room for new roads. Why has this area not been considered? | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. Much of the open land in the north and west of the borough is designated as Green Belt and, following review, there are no exceptional circumstances evident to change the existing boundaries and this land is unsuitable for housing development. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 895340 | | RESIDENT | LP2015526 | 2) Brownfield sites "You must finish your plate before you can have second helpings"€ç The emphasis on developing existing brownfield sites is welcomed. "ç However as all the low hanging fruit of small greenfield sites have been picked, the only areas for expansion are Murton, Rising Sun and Killingworth Moor. "ç Morally its only acceptable to encroach on these important green areas if there are NO | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | brownfield sites left to develop. ACTION: Hence best (i.e. more than reasonable) efforts must be taken to ensure all brownfield sites are developed before Murton and Killingworth. | | | shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development and it is currently considered that delivery from the proposed strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton will be required over the plan period to supplement delivery on brownfield sites. | broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 895341 | | RESIDENT | LP2015532 | 2) Brownfield sites "You must finish your plate before you can have second helpings"€ The emphasis on developing existing brownfield sites is welcomed. " However as all the low hanging fruit of small greenfield sites have been picked, the only areas for expansion are Mu1ton, Rising Sun and Killingworth Moor. " Morally its only acceptable to encroach on these important green areas if there are NO brownfield sites left to develop. ACTION: Hence best (i.e. more than reasonable) efforts must be taken to ensure all brownfield sites are developed before Murton and Killingworth. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development and it is currently considered that delivery from the proposed strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton will be required over the plan period to | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|------------|---|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | supplement delivery on brownfield sites. | |
| 396412 | Northumb erland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATI ON | LP2015543 | Site 35-41: NWT has serious concerns over the allocation of land for new housing on land that has already been targeted for off-site mitigation for existing developments such as Station Road mitigation land at Murton. Mitigation and compensatory land for biodiversity should not be developed. This will not contribute towards biodiversity net gain, nor does it plan positively for the "protection... of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure" (paragraph 114 of NNPF). NWT would seek that the LPA includes a policy that states that land used for mitigation for losses and adverse impacts on biodiversity should remain un-developed in perpetuity. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 895346 | | RESIDENT | LP2015544 | Site 128: I am writing to you to express the strong support that we feel for the designation of the Benton Curve as a very important wildlife corridor. As more and more green land is being eaten up by housing this small but important area needs to be preserved and maintained. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 895347 | | RESIDENT | LP2015546 | Site 128: I am writing to you to express the strong support that we feel for the designation of the Benton Curve as a very important wildlife corridor. As more and more green land is being eaten up by housing this small but important area needs to be preserved and maintained. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|---|--|
| 895349 | | RESIDENT | LP2015550 | Site 35 to 41: As I write this I am under no illusion that my concerns are going to be read and heeded but here goes. Our concern is the terrible shame that farmland/green area surround Murton Village/top of Cauldwell Ave/Rake Lane is going to be built on. The congestion of traffic/people is going to be horrendous and the pleasant surroundings for residents and non residents is once again going to be taken away. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015552 | Site 3: Objection: This site is adjacent to the Annitsford Pond LWS and as such development in this area is likely to isolate the site (thus not meeting the requirements of either paragraph 110 to minimise€ adverse effects on the local and natural environment or paragraph 114 plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity. The Seaton Burn runs through this site. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust, in conjunction with the LPA, have been doing works along this burn to restore it (as it is failing Water Framework Directive requirements) and to help mitigate flood risks along the burn catchment. Allocating development in this site would not only jeopardise the works already carried out but could also add to flood risk and the adverse impacts that are causing the burn to fail against WFD. | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. Proposals for development will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and ongoing improvement works to the Seaton Burn. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 895388 | | RESIDENT | LP2015556 | Site 17: I strongly oppose the building of houses on the green land on Station Road. Obviously big underhand handouts are being given and received to various 'important' people. Please add my name to stop this building on this lovely green area. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|--|--|---|
| 895388 | | RESIDENT | LP2015557 | North Shields, Monkseaton, Annitsford, Killingworth, Backworth, Seaton Burn, Wallsend - oppose to any housing in these areas. | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 519118 | | RESIDENT | LP2015559 | Site 17: I am particularly concerned over the proposal to build new homes on the lovely open space on Station Road, Wallsend. The land opposite 'The Range' shop. I think Persimmon want to build houses there. Please add my name to the petition to stop building on our open spaces. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|--------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | |
| 519118 | | RESIDENT | LP2015560 | Object to any development in these areas: Wallsend, Annitsford, Seaton Burn, Backworth, Killingworth, Monkseaton, North Shields. | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 457843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015561 | Site 17: I strongly oppose any new building of houses etc.. in North Tyneside, especially the fields either side of Station Road Wallsend. Wallsend would be ruined and chaos created. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|--------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | |
| 457843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015563 | Other sites too. Killingworth, Backworth, Seaton Burn, Annitsford, Monkseaton, North Shields, Wallsend oppose to any housing in these areas. | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015564 | Site 4: Objection: This site along with the allocation of site 109 will effectively cause the isolation of Gosforth Park SSSI and Local Wildlife Sites. Not only could this adversely impact upon a statutorily protected site (contrary to paragraph 118 of NPPF) but this would also have significant adverse effects upon the Wildlife Corridor, as such not meeting the requirements of paragraph 114 of NPPF to plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity. This site has approved planning permission on it. | Site 4 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Site 4 is included for assessment in the SHLAA (Site 333) and has been considered as a potential allocation for development through the Local Plan process. However, on consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retain as safeguarded land, potentially meeting the development needs of the borough post-2032. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015565 | Site 5: Objection: This site is situated within a wildlife corridor. Development in a wildlife corridor renders the objectives of a wildlife corridor untenable. | Site 5 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015566 | Site 9, now Site E008, : Objection: Whilst the Northumberland Wildlife Trust recognises that this site would be strategically placed for employment, we would have considerable concerns over any residential development in this area and its potential impacts (from increased footfall, pollution, runoff, changes to water levels and domestic pets etc.) due to its close proximity to Gosforth Park SSSI. Indeed we note a speculative submission has arisen due to this allocation. We would | Site 9, now Site E008, | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT055). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. A location which is adjacent to Gosforth Park Nature Reserve (SSSI) does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | also note that at present this land has ecological value from the scrub and rough grasslands that have established and that the site could have potential for ecologically sensitive flood mitigation should it be allocated for development. We would, therefore, suggest that if the LPA were to produce a strategic biodiversity mitigation/compensation plan, that this site be included in it. | | | through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. Further work is necessary, taking into account expert advice, to identify the scale and scope of development which would be appropriate. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015567 | Site 11 now Site E010: Objection: The development on land allocated as an SLCI would be contrary to paragraph 110 to minimise€' adverse effects on the local and natural environment or paragraph 114 plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust also notes that this area is of semi-improved neutral grassland (potentially mitigation for an earlier residential development). This habitat is a Local BAP priority and to develop is would be contrary to policy S/8.4 in the Local Plan and to paragraph 117 of NPPF to "promote the preservation€' of priority habitats€' . This statement remains current. | Site 11 now Site E010 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT031). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. A new policy is proposed designating an 'open break' which would cover the proposed safeguarded land to the south of West Moor and the northern section of Site 11 now Site E010 covering the SLCI. This proposal would reflect the significance of this open space to the character of West Moor and protection of biodiversity value. The Council biodiversity officer has recommended an adequate buffer for the | The Local Plan document includes indicative mapping for larger allocations identifying potential access points and possible strategic open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | SLCI. | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015568 | Site 17: Objection: The Northumberland Wildlife Trust does not consider this a suitable allocation as this area, alongside site 18 (now subject to approved planning permission) provide important habitat and buffer to the Rising Sun Country Park, as well as wildlife links. The site also includes mature hedgerows that also provide wildlife links across the area. This statement remains current. Again the wildlife corridor runs through this site. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Close proximity to the Rising Sun CP and partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015569 | Site 22-26: Objection: The Northumberland Wildlife Trust has considerable concerns over the impacts of development on these sites on the water quality and flooding of the Briardene. Like the Seaton Burn this watercourse was considered failing by the Environment Agency and the Northumberland Wildlife Trust, in conjunction with the LPA, have been carrying out works to mitigate for flood risks and water quality. To develop here could result in increased flood risk and a decrease in water quality. The | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>Northumberland Wildlife Trust notes that there appears to be areas of semi-improved grassland which may fall under the priority habitats of the Local BAP for neutral grasslands. Development of these would be contrary to paragraph 117 of NPPF to "promote the preservation of or priority habitats". This statement remains current. Additionally, wildlife corridors run through these sites. Without properly defined wildlife corridor boundaries ad hoc development will have significant impacts upon biodiversity and wildlife corridors, therefore not adhering to paragraph 114 of NPPF.</p> | | | <p>of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Proposals for development will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and ongoing improvement works to the Briardene. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015570 | <p>Site 29: Objection: This site has been subject to a planning application to which the Northumberland Wildlife Trust has objected. This application was refused and therefore it is unclear why this is still included in the Local Plan. This site supports a Local Wildlife Site. To develop this site would be contrary to paragraph 110 of NPPF to "minimise adverse effects on the local and natural environment", to paragraph 114 to "plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity" and to paragraph 117 of NPPF to "promote the preservation of or priority habitats" as this site supports neutral/basic semi-improved/unimproved grassland, a</p> | Site 29 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The application in question (12/00637/FUL) was refused in May 2015, after the LPCD 2015 was finalised and, indeed, after the close of the consultation exercise. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield.</p> <p>It is apparent that there are still significant obstacles to delivery. However the scheme submitted at the time was deemed acceptable by North Tyneside's biodiversity</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | BAP habitat. It would also be in contradiction to the Local Plan policy S/8.4c to conserve and enhance Local Sites. This statement remains current. | | | officer. It is considered that a 65 units scheme, as part of a mixed-use allocation, is still possible for this wider site but deliverability in the short-term is questionable. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015571 | Site 34: Objection: This site is partly Local Wildlife Site and mitigation for the developments at Cobalt Business Park. To develop the Local Wildlife site would be contrary to paragraph 110 of NPPF to "minimise" adverse effects on the local and natural environment, to paragraph 114 to "plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity" and to paragraph 117 of NPPF to "promote the preservation or priority habitats" as this site supports neutral/basic semi-improved/unimproved grassland, a BAP habitat. It would also be in contradiction to the Local Plan policy S/8.4c to conserve and enhance Local Sites. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust would also note that this area of land provides important grassland habitats that complements the largely wooded adjacent Country Park and also provide an important ecological buffer. The | Site 34 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (part NT030). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | Northumberland Wildlife Trust considers that there is little point in site mitigation if it is to be allocated for development further down the line. This ultimately does not mitigate for the permanent impacts of the previous development. This statement remains current. | | | | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015572 | <p>Site 35-41: Objection: The Northumberland Wildlife Trust has a number of concerns over the allocation of these sites (35-41). Firstly, a large proportion of this area has been offered as is a compensation site for permanent ecological losses from another housing development. To develop it would therefore render the ecological compensation of this previous application untenable. This area should, therefore, not be included in the development allocations. Secondly, parts of this site are being considered by the North Tyneside, Northumbrian Water and the Environment Agency to mitigate for flood risks across the borough. Not only would development here mean this needed flood mitigation would not be carried out, but it would also add to flood risk and water quality reductions. This statement remains current. Thirdly, it is very unclear why this area is has not been allocated as a Wildlife Corridor, as it is at present functioning as one, being some of the only open and connected green space in this area</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and</p> | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | (unlike parts of the Wildlife Corridor to the east; note that NPPF states that Wildlife Corridors are "areas of habitat connecting wildlife populations€ and therefore it would seem logical to allocate those areas where there is a green link as a Wildlife Corridor.). NPPF requires LPAs paragraph 117 to "identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including€; wildlife corridors. a€ The Northumberland Wildlife Trust feels that this has not been met. The wildlife corridor now runs through this site, however, as it is not excluded from development, there seems little point to it. | | | ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015573 | Site 75: Objection: The Northumberland Wildlife Trust is concerned that this is an area of woodland that has been allocated for development in an area where other more suitable sites for development are available. To develop here would be contrary to the LPAs own Local Plan policy DM/8.8 to support strategies and proposals that would protect and manage existing woodland. This statement remains current. | Site 75 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Comments noted. Following the submission of this representation, Planning Officers held a meeting with a representative from NWT during May 2015. NWT have subsequently withdrawn the objection relating to this particular site in light of an acknowledgement that there is no evidence to support the ecological merit previously identified. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015574 | Site 9, now Site E008, 9: Objection: The Northumberland Wildlife Trust has concerns over the allocation of this site | Site 9, now Site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | Trust | ON | | as it falls within a Wildlife Corridor and as such would be contrary to paragraph 114 of NPPF to "plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity". Furthermore, to develop this entire area would not support the aims of the LPAs own policy AS/8.9 for encouraging "improvements to the area for wildlife and recreation". A significant boundary revision would be sort for this site. This statement remains current. | E008, 9 | Housing Development Sites | suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 897553 | | RESIDENT | LP2015627 | Site 35-41: We love our new house and a huge deciding factor in choosing to buy this house (opposed to others we looked at) was the fantastic view from the upstairs bedroom windows over the fields to the Robin Hood Pub, Murton & beyond, we can even see the sea and the ships along the horizon. The fact we have had less than a few months to enjoy this our objections are I guess, purely selfish. Ideally if it was necessary to build here we would like to see it delayed for as long as possible. We were a little shocked to see this area "benchmarked" as having checked our 7 page NTC local land search documents from the solicitor in December page 2/1.2 planning designations & proposals,, the | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>questions asks what designated land use at the property or the area & what specific proposals are contained in any existing or proposed development plan? The answer is NONE. 3.4 asks is the property or will it be within 200m of a proposed new road or route under proposals published for public consultation. The answer again is NO. I find it hard to believe that this information wasn't known at the time of the search and think we may need to seek legal advice re: this. As if this goes ahead it may affect the market value of our house ?? Where we live already seems to be hugely congested at the moment. Since moving here I was shocked at the sheer volume of traffic passing through Park lane towards the Cobalt. Traffic jams at either end of the day exist from the Ford Garage all the way down to Shiremoor Metro station & beyond some days. We shouldn't be hasty in building 1000's of houses on our fields that hold so much history to the area, where our grandparents & their parents before them mined ,, in fact our Coal mining search said we in Angerton Ave were in the likely zone of 4 coal mining seams from shallow to 90m deep and while there were no planned works it does state that reserves of coal were still in existence in these seams & they may be worked in future as fuel supplies diminish. So</p> | | | <p>character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. This includes improvements to traffic flows on the A191 corridor and Park Lane. The Council is continuing to work with the Coal Authority to explore issues relating to existing coal reserves at Murton. This includes whether there will be any necessity to put in place measures to ensure this resource is not sterilised as a result of development.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | from what we thought were trusty searches we paid for we thought there was more likelihood of mining than building opposite our home. | | | | |
| 897553 | | RESIDENT | LP2015628 | New site: In terms of other areas, could we not look further afield & build new estates towards Dudley, Seaton Burn & the A1 as surely a lot of the future employment opportunities are going to arise from the opening of the new hospital. | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. Much of the open land in the north and west of the borough is designated as Green Belt and, following review, there are no exceptional circumstances evident to change the existing boundaries and this land is unsuitable for housing development. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 897553 | | RESIDENT | LP2015629 | New site: If we do need more housing in this section of the borough could we not look to build on & improve area's that are "lowering the tone" e.g.. The Beaumont Pub site, old Coop/Shiremoor Carpet Centre site, what's to happen to Shiremoor Club now closed, the area just along from the blue bell where the street/s were knocked down in the 60'70s that is just full of overgrown shrubs & litter, there are areas through Backworth where there are derelict looking buildings & I'm sure the old West Allotment | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. Each of the sites highlighted have been assessed through the SHLAA but has not been proposed a specific allocation either because there is an existing planning permission in place, the site has been identified for an alternative use to housing, | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | Community Centre behind the Northumberland Arms is stood derelict. Just to name a few when you drive around. | | | or falls below the size threshold for allocation. Despite this, any forecast delivery from these sites will be included in the allowance for windfall or small sites and will make a contribution to the overall housing requirement over the plan period. | |
| 897281 | | | LP2015614 | Site 139: There will be no more green areas in the area around Benton/Palmersville/Killingworth. To satisfy some greedy developer/councillor the council seems to be planning to create a giant traffic jam around the area leading to wall send or front street that will just be one massive conurbation from then on. what will happen to all the wildlife that lives in the area? What is going to happen to the schools that are already full to bursting? The lane end GP surgery where you cannot get an appointment for love or money? The ASDA is already busy beyond belief - what will happen with another 1000 homes built around there? If there is no plan to increase school places/upgrade roads/more doctors surgery the place will be an overcrowded nightmare - but then those things would cost the council money rather than making them more in council tax/selling off the land... | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | integral to any proposal. The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now 7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 897281 | | | LP2015615 | Site 11 now Site E0101: There will be no more green areas in the area around Benton/Palmersville/Killingworth. To satisfy some greedy developer/councillor the council seems to be planning to create a giant traffic jam around the area leading to wall send or front street that will just be one massive conurbation from then on. what will happen to all the wildlife that lives in the area? What is going to happen to the schools that are already full to bursting? The lane end GP surgery where you cannot get an appointment for love or money? The ASDA is already busy beyond belief - what will happen with another 1000 homes built around there? If there is no plan to increase school places/upgrade roads/more doctors surgery the place will be an overcrowded nightmare - but then those things would cost the council money rather than making them more in council tax/selling off the land... | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now 7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 897281 | | | LP2015616 | Site 17: There will be no more green areas in the area around Benton/Palmersville/Killingworth. To satisfy some greedy developer/councillor the council seems to be planning to create a giant traffic jam around the area leading to wall send or front street that will just be one massive conurbation from then on. what will happen to all the wildlife that lives in the area? What is going to happen to the schools that are already full to bursting? The lane end GP surgery where you cannot get an appointment for love or money? The ASDA is already busy beyond belief - what will happen with another 1000 homes built around there? If there is no plan to increase school places/upgrade roads/more doctors surgery the place will be an overcrowded nightmare - but then those things would cost the council money rather than making them more | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now 7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | in council tax/selling off the land... | | | part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 897081 | | | LP2015579 | Site 17: I am concerned with the proposal to designate land at site 17 as a potential housing site. For me there are two reasons to leave this land as greenfield. Firstly the transport infrastructure is already creaking at the seams. it only takes a minor disruption between four lane ends and the top of station road Wallsend to wreak havoc, for example the recent gas board works at the top of Coach Lane. An additional 500 households on top of the additional houses built or in the process at Blue Flames and adjacent to the Rising Sun pit heap will put an unsustainable burden on the local road infrastructure. Secondly there is a wildlife corridor following the Line of the electricity pylons linking the rising sun nature reserve with the east coast mainline and the metro line. The | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | proposed housing site will completely block this corridor. With regard to the pylons I am not convinced either way of the health effects of electricity pylons. However there will be maintenance issues and access will be required at some stage to the cables and pylons which will be compromised when there is a housing estate in the way. I feel this site has been chosen for the volume of housing that can be fitted on to it rather than for it's overall suitability for housing. | | | development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. The layout/design of development will take into account the need for access to the overhead lines, as per National Grid advice. | |
| 897267 | | | LP2015593 | Site 17: I find the decision to build houses on the 2 fields separating Wallsend from Benton is crazy. Building over these fields would mean that there is no green space from the riverside to the north end of Burradon and the Rising Sun country park would be completely isolated. The traffic is bad enough now without adding to it. We need to keep greenfield sites because once they're built on we will never get them back. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | |
| 897281 | | | LP2015594 | Site 15: There will be no more green areas in the area around Benton/Palmersville/Killingworth. To satisfy some greedy developer/councillor the council seems to be planning to create a giant traffic jam around the area leading to wall send or front street that will just be one massive conurbation from then on. what will happen to all the wildlife that lives in the area? What is going to happen to the schools that are already full to bursting? The lane end GP surgery where you cannot get an appointment for love or money? The ASDA is already busy beyond belief - what will happen with another 1000 homes built around there? If there is no plan to increase school places/upgrade roads/more doctors | Site 15 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The former St Bartholomew's Primary School is a brownfield site and has been made available due to restructuring of school provision in the area. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | surgery the place will be an overcrowded nightmare - but then those things would cost the council money rather than making them more in council tax/selling off the land... | | | continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 638861 | | RESIDENT | LP2015595 | Site 17: We wish to object to the planning proposal to build on fields adjacent to the Rising Sun Country Park. We believe this would remove an environmental facility from the public's enjoyment, damage wildlife, flora and fauna. The communities of Wallsend, Holystone, Benton and Forest Hall will be connected by urban identity and remove the last vestige of a rural oasis from our area. Furthermore it will add to the traffic problems already in existence. We wish this planning proposal to be rejected. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> <p>The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13(now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs.</p> | |
| 897293 | | RESIDENT | LP2015596 | <p>Site 17: We wish to object to the planning proposal to build on fields adjacent to the Rising Sun Country Park. We believe this would remove an environmental facility from the public's enjoyment, damage wildlife, flora and fauna. The communities of Wallsend, Holystone, Benton and Forest Hall will be connected by urban identity and remove the last vestige of a rural oasis from our area. Furthermore it will add to the traffic problems already in existence. We wish this planning proposal to be rejected.</p> | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> <p>The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs.</p> | |
| 897294 | | RESIDENT | LP2015597 | <p>Site 17: We wish to object to the planning proposal to build on fields adjacent to the Rising Sun Country Park. We believe this would remove an environmental facility from the public's enjoyment, damage wildlife, flora and fauna. The communities of Wallsend, Holystone, Benton and Forest Hall will be connected by urban identity and remove the last vestige of a rural oasis from our area. Furthermore it will add to the traffic problems already in existence. We wish this planning proposal to be rejected.</p> | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> <p>The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs.</p> | |
| 641298 | St Columba's United Reformed Church | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015598 | <p>Further to my previous correspondence raising objections to an item on the plan and following a visit to the exhibition in the Library on 2nd March, I am writing to re-emphasise my previous objections. This relates to item 61 on the suggested sites on the Development Plan i.e. Stephenson House, Unicorn House and Norfolk Street Car Park. 1. I have no objections demolishing of Stephenson and Unicorn Houses and their use for housing developments. 2. However I have strong objections to the use of the Norfolk Street Car for any type of housing, As an active</p> | Site 61 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Partial support for redevelopment noted. The Council is keen to promote the reuse of brownfield land in town centres and the Local Plan looks to focus development within the main urban area. However, the need to deliver new homes is not looked at in isolation and Policy S6.1 (now 3.1) aims to pursue growth and regeneration of town centres by delivering new development, but only when this is appropriate and not detrimental to existing circumstances. One priority of this policy is to enhance accessibility by all modes of transport and any proposals which would result in the loss of existing car parking would have to be carefully considered through the planning</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | member of St Columba's United Reformed Church, this car park is used by members of the congregation (many of whom are older people) throughout the week along with other people and organisations who also use the Church at various times. The Car Park is also valuable to many members of the public for access to the Library and shopping areas. On these grounds I again raise my objections to any development of the Norfolk Street Car Park. | | | process, including the resulting impact on existing shopping and community facilities, such as St Columba's URC. The Council also has a Parking Strategy which aims to manage the provision of parking in the borough which will provide further guidance. | |
| 897295 | | RESIDENT | LP2015604 | Site 35 to 41: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example part of sites 35-41 is to provide ecological compensation for a development elsewhere in the borough. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site. | |
| 897296 | | RESIDENT | LP2015606 | Site 17: I am emailing you to register my concern about the Local Plan recently delivered by the council. Namely, that all of the green field land adjacent to Whitley Road is proposed to be allocated to housing or industrial use. This would mean that there will be no green space left between Benton and Wallsend and Palmersville. Even the buffer between these areas would be gone. Once the green fields are gone, they are gone "" we cannot get them back. The area would become a huge housing estate. The pressure on the transport infrastructure would be vastly increased "" roads which are already struggling to cope with existing demands. The junction of Station Road and Whitley Road will become even more congested. Side Roads e.g. Thornhill Road and Grange Avenue will become even more of a rat run. There is already a huge number of entry/exit points on the road between Benton Quarry Park and Coach Lane. The Rising Sun Country Park will be completely enclosed by housing. Since | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | the consultation in 2012/13, two large areas of green field land adjacent to the Rising Sun Country Park have been granted planning permission for 1100 houses on top of those already built. They were originally part of the consultation to potentially remain as green field sites. | | | Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. Consideration of impacts on the local network, such as Thornhill Rd/Grange Ave, will also be necessary. The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 638512 | | | LP2015610 | Site 35-41: I was disturbed to learn that solar panels (strictly speaking, photovoltaic cells) would not be fitted as a matter of course to the new houses planned for Murton Village. It was explained to me at the consultation session at the new Whitley Bay library that the houses themselves would be insulated to a very high standard, which is commendable. But where were the solar panels? If it is not council policy to fit solar panels to all new-build properties, it should be. And if it is not changed by the council I will raise this through the Labour Party, of which I am a lowly member. Council builders (if there are any left) should be ordered by the council to fit solar | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council promotes the use of sustainable design and construction, including the schemes and proposals which incorporate energy generation from renewable sources. In particular, Policy DM10.8 (now DM7.6) supports the use of community-based renewal schemes and micro-generation technologies as part of an overall objective of reducing environmental impacts and delivering development which is environmentally sustainable. Although there are currently no proposals to enforce the installation of solar panels on the proposed strategic site at Murton, the use of such technology will be encouraged through the formal planning process. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | panels. Private builders should be ordered to do the same, and if they refuse, sack them and get other builders who would accept the council's orders. At present prices, to add Â£1,000 or Â£2,000 to the price of a house of, perhaps, Â£150,000 would not be noticed by a buyer if they can get a mortgage. The solar panels should be fitted not only to keep electricity bills down but also to sell clean energy to the national grid. That is the main point. We have to turn each house/school/library into a mini power station, so that the whole of Tyneside can become a huge power station made up of individual solar panels. I know the council fits some solar panels to schools and some houses, but what exactly is the council's policy? Everyone knows it is more efficient to fit solar panels as part of the building process, rather than retro-fit them. I would be willing to discuss this personally with the planning team/the Mayor/individual councillors but would hope you could first explain exactly what council policy is on solar panels. | | | | |
| | | | LP2015612 | Having reviewed the plan I am totally opposed to any development of Site 11 now Site E010 (Land in between Greenhaugh & Balliol business park) Site 11 now Site E010 is an area of local wildlife interest & is a major wildlife corridor, the only one left in West | Site 11 now Site E010 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT031). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | Moor & the main artery for the wider area, providing a vital link to Gosforth woods & the Rising Sun Country park. Site 11 now Site E010 is already a well utilized equestrian centre & is the only one in the area, removal of which would be detrimental to the local & wider community. The roads around Site 11 now Site E010 are already massively congested, at peak times the traffic is at a complete stand still. Any development of Site 11 now Site E010 would only add more traffic problems to an already crippled network. I have reviewed the councils proposed transport/roads improvements & do not believe they will provide any benefits or ease the current congestion problems. Please confirm my comments & opposition the development of Site 11 now Site E010 will be logged/recorded & taken forward by the council. | | | designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. A new policy is proposed designating an 'open break' which would cover the proposed safeguarded land to the south of West Moor and the northern section of Site 11 now Site E010 covering the SLCI. This proposal would reflect the significance of this open space to the character of West Moor and protection of biodiversity value. The Council biodiversity officer has recommended an adequate buffer for the SLCI. | |
| 897407 | | RESIDENT | LP2015621 | Site 17: I wish to strongly object to the proposal of development of the greenfield site. This area provides a mini-greenbelt between Benton and Wallsend and provides both areas with separate identities. Local infrastructure would struggle to cope as is already the case on Whitley Road. This results in increased traffic (at significant speed) through Grange Avenue / Thornhill Road (both residential roads). Development of these sites would lose the view from Whitley Road across to | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | Gateshead further detracting from the area. | | | <p>improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. Consideration of impacts on the local network, such as Thornhill Rd/Grange Ave, will also be necessary.</p> <p>The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs.</p> | |
| 894216 | | | LP2015655 | Site 139: To Mary Glindon, As a resident and voter in the Benton ward, North Tyneside, I wish to register my absolute objection to the proposed development of the green field sites | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>running adjacent to Whitley Road. I object to the placing, quantity and type of housing proposed. I object to the lack of sustainable Eco friendly housing. I object to the siting of houses which mean residents will need to use cars rather than enabling residents to access work places by foot or bike. I object to the total obliteration of wildlife corridors and the impact this will have. I object to the additional denigration of a Rising Sun parks overall area, further limiting residents access to dwindling green spaces. I object to the additional quantity of cars it will put onto a local road system which is already in crisis; Whitley rd/ station road/ great lime road. I object to the lack of 'buffer areas' between Benton, Palmersville and Wallsend. I object to the denigration of air quality and increased environmental pollution new housing will create. I object to the fact we are not looking first to regenerate old housing stock, this should be the councils starting point. I object to the council making short term, environmentally unsound, irresponsible decisions.</p> | | Sites | <p>development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|--|---|
| 897407 | | RESIDENT | LP2015622 | <p>Site 11 now Site E0101: I wish to strongly object to the proposal of development of the greenfield site. This area provides a mini-greenbelt between Benton and Wallsend and provides both areas with separate identities. Local infrastructure would struggle to cope as is already the case on Whitley Road. This results in increased traffic (at significant speed) through Grange Avenue / Thornhill Road (both residential roads). Development of these sites would lose the view from Whitley Road across to Gateshead further detracting from the area.</p> | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. Consideration of impacts on the local network, such as Thornhill Rd/Grange Ave, will also be necessary.</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.9) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 894216 | | | LP2015657 | Site 17: To Mary Glindon, As a resident and voter in the Benton ward, North Tyneside, I wish to register my absolute objection to the proposed development of the green field sites running adjacent to Whitley Road. I object to the placing, quantity and type of housing proposed. I object to the lack of sustainable Eco friendly housing. I object to the siting of houses which mean residents will need to use cars rather than enabling residents to access work places by foot or bike. I object to the total obliteration of wildlife corridors and the impact this will have. I object to the additional denigration of a Rising Sun parks overall area, further limiting residents access to dwindling green spaces. I object to the additional quantity of cars it will put onto a local road system which is already in crisis; Whitley rd/ station road/ great lime road. I object to the lack of 'buffer areas' between Benton, Palmersville and Wallsend. I object to the denigration of air quality and increased environmental pollution new housing will create. I object to the | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S 7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | fact we are not looking first to regenerate old housing stock, this should be the councils starting point. I object to the council making short term, environmentally unsound, irresponsible decisions. | | | <p>promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> <p>The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs.</p> <p>The role that empty homes can play in providing additional housing is identified through the Local Plan and Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) includes the objective to bring these back into use. An allowance for windfall development is made through the Local Plan, based on past trends and evidenced through the SHLAA, which provides a small proportion of the total housing requirement to 2032. This windfall allowance includes supply from bringing empty/vacant homes back into use.</p> | |
| 897407 | | RESIDENT | LP2015623 | Site 139: I wish to strongly object to the proposal of development of the greenfield site. This area provides a mini-greenbelt between Benton and Wallsend and provides both areas with separate identities. Local infrastructure would struggle to cope as is already the case on Whitley Road. This results in increased traffic (at significant speed) through Grange Avenue / Thornhill Road (both residential roads). | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | Development of these sites would lose the view from Whitley Road across to Gateshead further detracting from the area. | | | resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now 7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. Consideration of impacts on the local network, such as Thornhill Rd/Grange Ave, will also be necessary. The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 897407 | | RESIDENT | LP2015624 | Site 128: I would like to strongly support the designation of the 'Benton Curve' disused railway line as a wildlife corridor. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | Development Sites | representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | |
| 894216 | | | LP2015630 | Site 15: To Mary Glindon, As a resident and voter in the Benton ward, North Tyneside, I wish to register my absolute objection to the proposed development of the green field sites running adjacent to Whitley Road. I object to the placing, quantity and type of housing proposed. I object to the lack of sustainable Eco friendly housing. I object to the siting of houses which mean residents will need to use cars rather than enabling residents to access work places by foot or bike. I object to the total obliteration of wildlife corridors and the impact this will have. I object to the additional denigration of a Rising Sun parks overall area, further limiting residents access to dwindling green spaces. I object to the additional quantity of cars it will put onto a local road system which is already in crisis; Whitley rd/ station road/ great lime road. I object to the lack of 'buffer areas' between Benton, palmersville and Wallsend. I object to the denigration of air quality and increased environmental pollution new housing will create. I object to the fact we are not looking first to regenerate old housing stock, this should be the councils starting point. I object to the council making short | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now 7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | term, environmentally unsound, irresponsible decisions. | | | <p>any proposal.</p> <p>The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now 7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs.</p> <p>The role that empty homes can play in providing additional housing is identified through the Local Plan and Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) includes the objective to bring these back into use. An allowance for windfall development is made through the Local Plan, based on past trends and evidenced through the SHLAA, which provides a small proportion of the total housing requirement to 2032. This windfall allowance includes supply from bringing empty/vacant homes back into use.</p> | |
| 804813 | | | LP2015635 | Site 35-41: We are very concerned that the amount of suggested housing around Murton will take up a large part of the open space there at present. On the map, this area is left white, which means it is hard to see clearly the extent of the loss of green or open space, and how far the proposed housing would contribute to a solid mass of built-up area. The buffer zone is so small as to be negligible. Since 'blocks' of green or park land are marked for housing, the whole area of North Tyneside will, in effect, be densely covered in housing | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | for which other amenities will have to be built. The gaps in building which you say are to 'protect the identity' of various communities are so small as to be pointless. | | | significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | detailed masterplanning. |
| 897599 | | RESIDENT | LP2015638 | Several development sites in the borough appear to be at odds with the requirements of Chapter 11 of the NPPF "Conserving and enhancing the natural environment". As you will be aware, the requirements include the following: "To minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible." "To recognise the wider benefits of ecosystem services." "To explore and encourage opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments." "To refuse planning permission if significant harm cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for." "To refuse planning permission if development will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats... | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 897599 | | RESIDENT | LP2015639 | Site NT031: Several development sites in the borough appear to be at odds with the requirements of Chapter 11 of the NPPF "Conserving and enhancing the natural environment". Specifically, your Forest Hall proposal (Site 11 now Site E010) contains a Site of Local Wildlife Interest. I believe these developments contravene | Site 11 now Site E010 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT031). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | Planning Policy. | | | <p>inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield.</p> <p>A new policy is proposed designating an 'open break' which would cover the proposed safeguarded land to the south of West Moor and the northern section of Site 11 now Site E010 covering the SLCI. This proposal would reflect the significance of this open space to the character of West Moor and protection of biodiversity value. The Council biodiversity officer has recommended an adequate buffer for the SLCI.</p> | |
| 897599 | | RESIDENT | LP2015640 | <p>Site NT058: Several development sites in the borough appear to be at odds with the requirements of Chapter 11 of the NPPF "Conserving and enhancing the natural environment". Specifically, the employment land north of Gosforth Park (site 109) cuts across a Wildlife Corridor. I believe these developments contravene Planning Policy.</p> | Site 109 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT058).</p> <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. National planning policy requires LPAs to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife and the Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and</p> | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. | |
| 897599 | | RESIDENT | LP2015641 | Site 35 to 41: Several development sites in the borough appear to be at odds with the requirements of Chapter 11 of the NPPF "Conserving and enhancing the natural environment". Specifically, Murton site (site 35-41) is being used to provide ecological compensation for development elsewhere in the borough. I believe these developments contravene Planning Policy. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 897599 | | RESIDENT | LP2015642 | Site NT055: I also wish to object to the proposed leisure development opposite Gosforth Park Nature Reserve, which is on a scale that is bound to have implications not just for the wildlife that has already colonised this site, but will have a detrimental effect on the nature reserve itself. | Site 9, now Site E008, | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT055). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. A location which is adjacent to Gosforth Park Nature Reserve (SSSI) does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | development and overall yield. Further work is necessary, taking into account expert advice, to identify the scale and scope of development which would be appropriate. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 808139 | | RESIDENT | LP2015645 | Site 35 to 41: Over the years building work has encroached on the surrounding Greenfield sites in this area until now you have urban sprawl from the River Tyne to the southern border of the Shiremoor/Murton site. In what was once the village of New York we have recently lost one of the last small bastions of greenbelt to a small housing development? Public footpaths criss/cross this site thereby granting access to this large open space. To the south of this area bats can be seen in the evenings during the warmer months, there is also a large pond, habitat to geese, ducks, moorhens and various other species of bird life, newts and other amphibians etc., etc., this being a well, used wildlife corridor will no doubt be lost. Providing another corridor some distance away does not guarantee their future. This area could be developed into a park for the benefit of the community and wildlife, this is in easy reach within the locality. I also | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of Policy AS4.4(A) , is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The land to the north of the Metro line is currently designated as Green Belt. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | notice that the land to the north of the Metro line is not to be developed. | | | release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | |
| 897668 | | RESIDENT | LP2015653 | Site NT055: Re. Greenfield provision v. Development. South border, Gosforth Park Nature Reserve. Please could you reconsider the land to the south east of Salters Lane - a strip of maybe 150m wide be designated 'green field' to provide some protection for the Reserve? I gather you are consulting on your Development Land and under the pressure of greater understanding of countryside within urban area and its increasing value as a natural resource for the good of the community - please serious review this strip as a buffer and strengthening of the Nature Reserve. | Site 9, now Site E008, | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT055). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. Further work is necessary, taking into account expert advice, to identify the scale and scope of development which would be appropriate. This includes the necessity of a buffer to Gosforth Park. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 897672 | | RESIDENT | LP2015654 | Site 128: I strongly support the designation of the Benton Curve as a wildlife corridor and would strongly oppose any development of that land | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015662 | Positively Prepared - no Justified - no Effective - no Consistency to NPPF - no | General | S 7.3 Distribution of | Comments noted. The Council recognises the impact that the legacy of the mining | The sites allocated for housing development |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - yes Objection: The Coal Authority supports the recognition within criterion b. that regard will be had to the suitability, availability and viability of sites taking into account the constraints affecting potential development sites and the potential for delivery to mitigate any impacts. Mine entries in particular are a potential development constraint on capacity and layouts of sites. Other mining legacy features should also be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. The Coal Authority is also pleased to see that the Site Analysis 2015 identifies those sites which are within the defined Development High Risk Area. However, neither the Site Analysis nor the Sustainable Appraisal appears to consider mineral</p> | | Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>industry could play in shaping the future development of the borough, particularly in selecting the preferred sites for development, and will continue to work with the Coal Authority in both developing planning policy and through the development management process. Further work is to be undertaken to consider mineral safeguarding and potential prior extraction opportunities in order to provide the necessary evidence for the next stage of the Local Plan.</p> | <p>through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | safeguarding and potential prior extraction opportunities. Mineral safeguarding and potential for prior extraction should be a consideration when identifying sites for new development in order to ensure that there is no needless sterilisation of minerals on allocated sites. | | | | |
| 897784 | | RESIDENT | LP2015672 | Site 22 to 26: Killingworth Moor - a development of this site with the need for its own schools, shops etc just becomes its own town. Who preserves the conservation areas and wildlife corridors etc in the future - they could easily be lost in the development. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now Policy AS4.4 (A)), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, the requirement for additional services and facilities will also be considered, including schools and retail provision. More generally, the importance of community services is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now 7.1) which outline how the Council will respond | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 897784 | | RESIDENT | LP2015673 | "Preferred Sites" - surely provokes a "not in my backyard" response? Keep North Tyneside green please. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 897792 | | RESIDENT | LP2015675 | Site 35-41: I object to you trying to take the last bit of unspoilt land. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 897839 | | | LP2015676 | Site 35 - 41: I oppose the development of up to 3,000 new homes between Murton and West Monkseaton. This objection is based on the following points: Congestion - Earsdon/Seatonville Road and Rake | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of Policy 7.4 (now Policy AS4.4 (A)), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>Lane are seriously congested at peak times, and are congested at most other times. The congestion of Rake Lane has increased significantly as Cobalt Park has developed, and the addition of further housing will make the traffic situation intolerable. Flooding - West Monkseaton area has suffered from severe flooding recently, and further development to this area will certainly exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>Environmental - The land east of Murton is the last green corridor before the heavily developed Monkseaton / Whitley Bay area. Removal of a significant portion of this will result in no significant green areas remaining from the coast to the A19. This will run counter to making North Tyneside a pleasant place to live.</p> | | | <p>the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development</p> | <p>the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 897837 | | | LP2015677 | I have read a number of the comments on this particular comments and in particular I think that comments LP2015629, LP2015533 and LP2015627 are valid and well made. Site 35-41: Whilst I recognise the need for plans to be put into place, I agree that to build on the likes of Killingworth Moor, Murton Village and land around Weetslade and Gosforth Parks would be an absolute travesty. With regard to the proposed plans of up to 3000 houses in the Murton area, I fail to see how that would not affect massively the fabric of the "village". If the maximum number of houses were built, I think it is fair to assume that most homes nowadays have at least two cars. This would potentially put an extra 6,000 cars on the road in this area. I believe that would completely destroy the fabric of that village. I also note the comments about traffic congestion in and around the Park Lane areas being congested especially heading towards the Cobalt Business Park. I note from the proposed plan that there is an intention to build a road that runs from Norham Road, straight through the fields on the outskirts of Murton to Earsdon. In reality that road would likely be a dual | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of Policy 7.4 (now Policy AS4.4 (A)), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. The role, route and impact of the proposed link road will be an important issue for consideration. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>carriageway, such as the ones that have been built near to Earsdon View and around the back of that estate and towards Northumberland Park. At that time that those roads were built, it was my understanding that it would stop congestion forming in and around the Park Lane area and also ease access for people to get to Cobalt. Sadly that does not happen and people seem to find it quicker to use Park Lane. My concern with the plans in this area as a whole, is not only would it destroy Village life in Murton. It would destroy the pleasure of many a family, dog walker, horse rider and blackberry pickers but it would also cut the greenfields in two with a dual carriageway. - What impact will that have on all of the residents, businesses and users of this open spaces that are truly cherished in this area of North Tyneside?</p> | | | <p>transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> | |
| 897837 | | | LP2015679 | <p>Site 22-26: I have read a number of the comments on this particular comments and in particular I think that comments LP2015629, LP2015533 and LP2015627 are valid and well made. Whilst I recognise the need for plans to be put into place, I agree that to build on the likes of Killingworth Moor, Murton Village and land around Weetslade and Gosforth Parks would be an absolute travesty.</p> | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Objection to development noted.</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 897919 | | RESIDENT | LP2015683 | Site 35-41: I wish to object to your proposal for houses around Murton. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 897599 | | RESIDENT | LP2015685 | We're opposed to all further development on greenfield sites, wildlife corridors and sites of local wildlife interest. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2(now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. | |
| 396641 | | RESIDENT | LP2015689 | Site 139: I am concerned as these areas are across the green belt corridor which I hope the Council would keep clear, as shown on the map. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This land is not within the statutory Green Belt as designated through the North Tyneside Unitary Development Plan (UDP). Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396641 | | RESIDENT | LP2015690 | Site 17: I am concerned as these areas are across the green belt corridor which I hope the Council would keep clear, as shown on the map. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This land is not within the statutory Green Belt as designated through the North Tyneside Unitary Development Plan (UDP). Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | |
| 803472 | | RESIDENT | LP2015693 | Site 35 to 41: I strongly object to this proposed site due to the loss of green area to this location. Already building on green land near to Sainsbury's - Monkseaton will have no green land left. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 803472 | | RESIDENT | LP2015694 | New site: alternative location - Dudley. | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. Much of the open land in the north and west of the borough is designated as Green Belt and, following review, there are no | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | exceptional circumstances evident to change the existing boundaries and this land is unsuitable for housing development. However, the redevelopment of brownfield sites, including in Dudley, is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). | |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP2015698 | Site 22 to 26: [at the Killingworth drop-in session] I did not hear any residents in favour of the suggested strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor to accommodate 4,500 houses between them, and a 17 hectares employment site along the east side of the A19 on Killingworth Moor. But I accept Killingworth Moor and Murton will have to take some housing development and did not object to the planning applications for housing at the former REME site on Killingworth Moor, the old Norgas House and Stevenson House sites in Killingworth and the old Thermal syndicate site at Palmersville, and the recent Castle Park/Backworth site for 290 houses. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Comments noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP2015699 | Site 35 to 41: [at the Killingworth drop-in session] I did not hear any residents in favour of the suggested strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor to accommodate 4,500 houses between them, and a 17 hectares employment site along the east side of the A19 on Killingworth Moor. But I accept Killingworth Moor and Murton will have to take some housing development and did not object to the | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Comments noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | planning applications for housing at the former REME site on Killingworth Moor, the old Norgas House and Stevenson House sites in Killingworth and the old Thermal syndicate site at Palmersville and the recent Castle Park/Backworth site for 290 houses. | | | | broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP2015700 | Why not build some of the 4,500 houses and the 17 hectares employment site in the North West area as it has the A1, A19, A190 roads to accommodate the traffic and surplus school places, negating the need to build new schools, saving the council/the government £millions, the U.K. is over £1 trillion in debt! The green belt land lost could be transferred down in to green belt, wildlife corridors on to Killingworth Moor and Murton and preserve the character and identities of the areas. | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. Much of the open land in the north and west of the borough is designated as Green Belt and, following review, there are no exceptional circumstances evident to change the existing boundaries and this land is unsuitable for housing development. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 898159 | | RESIDENT | LP2015708 | Site 35 to 41: I strongly oppose building 3,000 new homes on this site. The imposition of 3,000 new homes on the Murton site will cause significant problems for local transport, may impact on surface level flooding of neighbouring properties (already a problem) and almost certainly cause house values in my area to fall. This is open green farmland and a pleasant place to live at present. I think you | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>should drastically reduce the proposed number of new homes and explore sharing them more equitably around the Borough to give a fairer spread of development, which is preferable to two large communities being imposed on us. I think the creation of 3,000 new homes on the proposed site would have a completely negative impact on the West Monkseaton, Murton and Earsdon areas and be undesirable aesthetically.</p> | | | <p>and appropriate allocations are selected. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now S4.4), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. The role, route and impact of the proposed link road will be an important issue for consideration. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated</p> | <p>broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> <p>The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | |
| 807842 | | RESIDENT | LP2015709 | <p>Site 35 to 41: As stated in our letter dated 16 December 2013, we fully accept the need to build new houses to support the economic recovery of the UK. We also accept that a proportion of the additional 10,000 new homes it is proposed should be provided in the Borough should be built on the designated Murton site. However, to build almost one third of the total on this one site does seem to be somewhat excessive and would inevitably lead to a massive increase in the already existing congestion issues on the roads in and around Monkseaton.</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now AS4.4 (A)), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | |
| 898166 | | RESIDENT | LP2015711 | Site 35 to 41: As stated in our letter of 16 December 2013, we fully accept the need to build new houses to support the economic recovery of the UK. We also accept that a proportion of the additional 10,000 new homes it is proposed should be provided in the Borough should be built on the designated Murton site. However, to build almost one third of the total on this one site does seem to be somewhat excessive and would inevitably lead to a massive increase in the already existing congestion issues on the roads in and around Monkseaton. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now AS4.4 (A)), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | |
| 898174 | | RESIDENT | LP2015714 | Major concerns with regards to New York Road. Congestion is horrendous already at rush hours due to Cobalt Business Park and New builds and West Allotment. More housing will exacerbate issue. Flooding in my estate continues to be problematic. Building on flood plain fields. Drainage will be reduced further. Insurance premiums and house prices to existing properties will be affected. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now AS4.4 (A)), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 898174 | | RESIDENT | LP2015715 | Site 35-41: Not my job to suggest alternative. Try looking at fields at St Mary's and Whitley Bay ward. | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. Much of the open land to the north of Whitley Bay is designated as Green Belt and, following review, there are no exceptional circumstances evident to change the existing boundaries and this land is unsuitable for housing development. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 898182 | | RESIDENT | LP2015719 | Site 35- 41: I have lived in West Allotment close on 50 years and have seen all the farming land gradually turned into retail units, office units and housing. The congestion around the cobalt is really bad. I just think it would be nice to have some fields left to enjoy. I often walk to the Wheatsheaf and through to Murton which is a | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now S4.4), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | lovely quaint little village (like west allotment once was). Why spoil that...there must be alternatives further afield. | | | This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 795623 | | RESIDENT | LP2015721 | Site 35-41: The cut back of 500 homes is better- but I'm still concerned about affects on flooding, roads and diversity of wildlife. I also wonder where all the families will go for medical/dental practices or schools. Also public transport for those who need it. I know we need more work and homes for people though the whole of the area. I trust that all these changes do not | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now S4.4), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | affect too many things for the worst. | | | constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|--|---|
| 898192 | | RESIDENT | LP2015722 | I totally object to the proposal for these new homes. It will entirely ruin our green areas and will cause more traffic congestion on already severely congested roads. Our schools and doctors surgeries are already struggling to cope with growing numbers in our area. It will provide a total negative impact on the area and it appears the Labour Council can ruin our supposedly protect green areas with little consequence. It is disgusting!!! | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. The importance of community services, including schools and GP surgeries, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 898208 | | RESIDENT | LP2015728 | Site 35 to 41: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example part of sites 35-41 is to | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now S4.4), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | provide ecological compensation for a development elsewhere in the borough. | | Development Sites | development in a coherent, sustainable manner. Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site. | of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 898230 | | RESIDENT | LP2015735 | Site 35 to 41: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example part of sites 35-41 is to provide ecological compensation for a development elsewhere in the borough. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now AS4.4(A)), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 590531 | | | LP2015737 | Sites 22 "" 26: "ç I also think that 2000 homes in Killingworth Moor is excessive, the roads in the area can't cope with more traffic. "ç What about public transport? The metro doesn't run near Killingworth and bus services in West Moor, Killingworth and Forest Hall are getting worse "" they only | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now AS4.4 (A)), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | cater for people working in Quorum. No thought goes into how residents can get around the area or Newcastle "quickly" This is currently the only green land left in this part of North Tyneside, having lost Whitehouse Farm it would be nice to keep some country aspects in this area " I quite often walk around West Moor and Killingworth | | | 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 590531 | | | LP2015740 | Site 5: I also object to mixed use - there is already plenty housing / | Site 5 | S 7.3 Distribution of | This area of Killingworth is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | employment in this area without adding more, all the reasons above apply. | | Potential Housing Development Sites | Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1)and through this suggested allocation. | |
| 590531 | | | LP2015741 | Site 6: I also object to mixed use - there is already plenty housing / employment in this area without adding more, all the reasons above apply. | Site 6 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This area of Killingworth is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1)and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 590531 | | | LP2015742 | Site 7: I also object to mixed use - there is already plenty housing / | Site 7 | S 7.3 Distribution of | This area of Killingworth is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | employment in this area without adding more, all the reasons above apply. | | Potential Housing Development Sites | Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | |
| 898311 | | RESIDENT | LP2015744 | Sites 54 to 57: I would like to see great flexibility regarding sites at North Shields Fish Quay, so that the provision of new business premises is given equal importance to residential development. | Site 54 to 57 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This wider area of North Shields is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. In this, the Council is aware of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site. This proposal not only reflects the need for new homes but also the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | requirement for land to facilitate economic growth in a sustainable manner. | |
| 898311 | | RESIDENT | LP2015745 | Site 58: I would like to see great flexibility regarding sites at North Shields Fish Quay, so that the provision of new business premises is given equal importance to residential development. | Site 58 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This wider area of North Shields is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. In this, the Council is aware of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site. This proposal not only reflects the need for new homes but also the requirement for land to facilitate economic growth in a sustainable manner. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898311 | | RESIDENT | LP2015746 | Site 59: I would like to see great flexibility regarding sites at North Shields Fish Quay, so that the provision of new business premises is given equal importance to residential development. | Site 59 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This wider area of North Shields is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. In this, the Council is aware of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site. This proposal not only reflects the need for new homes but also the requirement for land to facilitate economic growth in a sustainable manner. | |
| 898311 | | RESIDENT | LP2015747 | Site 137: I would like to see great flexibility regarding sites at North Shields Fish Quay, so that the provision of new business premises is given equal importance to residential development. | Site 137 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This wider area of North Shields is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. In this, the Council is aware of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site. This proposal not only reflects the need for new homes but also the requirement for land to facilitate economic growth in a sustainable manner. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898311 | | RESIDENT | LP2015748 | Site 71: At north Shields, sites 71, 72 and 73 are all designated for residential development. I would urge that consideration is given to reserving | Site 71 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | The requirement for additional facilities in the Fish Quay area to support the tourism sector is recognised through Policy AS1.4 (now AS8.12). It is not considered that this | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | one of these sites to provide a coach parking facility, particularly for visitors to the Fish Quay. The area is becoming increasingly popular with visitors. NTC wish to see tourism developed; the Old Low Light Heritage Centre opens fully this month [March] and the refurbished TVLB Watch House expects more visitors. With increased advertisement planned, visitors are expected to arrive by the coach load, and the nearest coach park is at Whitley Bay north! | | Development Sites | site would be suitable for providing parking for coaches, however the need for such a facility will be monitored and further considered as, and when, necessary. | |
| 898311 | | RESIDENT | LP2015749 | Site 72: At north Shields, sites 71, 72 and 73 are all designated for residential development. I would urge that consideration is given to reserving one of these sites to provide a coach parking facility, particularly for visitors to the Fish Quay. The area is becoming increasingly popular with visitors. NTC wish to see tourism developed; the Old Low Light Heritage Centre opens fully this month [March] and the refurbished TVLB Watch House expects more visitors. With increased advertisement planned, visitors are expected to arrive by the coach load, and the nearest coach park is at Whitley Bay north! | Site 72 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The requirement for additional facilities in the Fish Quay area to support the tourism sector is recognised through Policy AS1.4 (now AS8.12). It is not considered that this site would be suitable for providing parking for coaches, however the need for such a facility will be monitored and further considered as, and when, necessary. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898311 | | RESIDENT | LP2015750 | Site 73: At north Shields, sites 71, 72 and 73 are all designated for residential development. I would urge that consideration is given to reserving one of these sites to provide a coach parking facility, particularly for visitors | Site 73 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The requirement for additional facilities in the Fish Quay area to support the tourism sector is recognised through Policy AS1.4 (now AS8.12). It is not considered that this site would be suitable for providing parking for coaches, however the need for such a | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | to the Fish Quay. The area is becoming increasingly popular with visitors. NTC wish to see tourism developed; the Old Low Light Heritage Centre opens fully this month [March] and the refurbished TVLB Watch House expects more visitors. With increased advertisement planned, visitors are expected to arrive by the coach load, and the nearest coach park is at Whitley Bay north! | | | facility will be monitored and further considered as, and when, necessary. | |
| 894854 | | | LP2015753 | Site 35-41: I object strongly to any further development on open land around New York and Murton. This open area is well used by the residents of Monkseaton , Shiremoor, Murton, New York, and surrounding areas for recreation, i.e. well used by cyclists, walkers, horse riders and considered to be irreplaceable as such. Did I read that this country can only supply 60% of the food needed to feed ourselves, then the question arises how can responsible authorities contemplate using up valuable Farming Land?. 3000 more homes = 3-4000 thousand more cars. Utter madness. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now AS4.4 (A)), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The Local Plan does not have any direct influence over the link between where food is produced and where it is consumed. However the importance of agricultural land | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>in creating a sustainable future is recognised and the retention of the current Green Belt boundaries will ensure that significant tracts of productive agricultural land are protected from development over the plan period and beyond. Further evidence relating to agricultural land classification within the borough has been requested from Natural England.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> | |
| 804850 | | | LP2015756 | New site: An old brownfield former mine site has been completely ignored around East Holywell, these sites should be considered before building on arable land | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 11 now Site E0102). The SHLAA currently concludes that this site is unsuitable for residential development. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period.</p> | <p>The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| 898375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015764 | Site 35 to 41: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example part of sites 35-41 is to provide ecological compensation for a development elsewhere in the borough. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now AS4.4(A)), is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 804850 | | | LP2015767 | Site 22-26: Any development considered should be along the A19 or A189 corridors as there is ample land from the Tyne Tunnel up as far as Killingworth. Using this land would provide easy access to main trunk roads via new slip roads etc. .It appears bias that there are possibly going to be more houses built on the Murton Gap than at Killingworth, this is grossly unfair. Killingworth is by far the more favourable site as it will have less impact for all with its location being on the A19 and A189 | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy (now AS4.4(A)), is being prepared to deliver the both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. Together this process will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 4,500 homes between the two sites, with the exact balance still to be determined, a decision which will take into account a wide variety of evidence and site constraints. The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. | |
| 791057 | | RESIDENT | LP2015771 | Site 35-41: There is lots of empty homes in the region, we don't need this level of construction, it is just Labour ticking a box to say they are meeting their KPI. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015776 | Site 12: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 12 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015777 | Site 13: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 13 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015778 | Site 15: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 15 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015779 | Site 17: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015780 | Site 45: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015781 | Site 52: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council | Site 52 | S 7.3 Distribution of | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | | Potential Housing Development Sites | borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM 4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015782 | Site 53: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 53 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015783 | Site 79: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have | Site 79 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | | Development Sites | sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015784 | Site 80: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 80 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015785 | Site 81: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to | Site 81 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|--------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | | | having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015787 | Site 9, now Site E008, 5: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 9, now Site E008, 5 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015788 | Site 9, now Site E008, 6: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their | Site 9, now Site E008, 6 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | shortage. | | | that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015789 | Site 9, now Site E008, 7: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 9, now Site E008, 7 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015790 | Site 9, now Site E008, 8: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 9, now Site E008, 8 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015791 | Site 100: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 100 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015792 | Site 101: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015793 | Site 11 now Site E0101: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM 4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015794 | Site 120: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 120 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015795 | Site 129: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 129 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015796 | Site 135: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 135 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | remain affordable in perpetuity. | |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015797 | Site 139: I strongly believe all of these sites should be North Tyneside Council homes to rent (not private developments). The money they have had over the years from the right to buy scheme now needs to be used to replenish their housing stock and address their shortage. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council has embarked on a project to build up to 3,000 additional LA homes in the borough, with Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supporting the programme. A wide range of sites have been identified to meet this total, with the first tranche of completions already having been delivered. In addition, a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898437 | | RESIDENT | LP2015801 | Site 128: I am writing to express my strong support of the local authority in achieving the designation for the disused railway at the Benton Curve, as a wildlife corridor. The need for the appreciation of wildlife in our local area is highly important. The children in the area love to watch the birds and with the sight of the odd fox and plenty of little hedgehogs, causes much excitement. There is little enough for our children to get excited about, in these troubled times and the loss of such a lovely bit of nature would be devastating to our little community here in Benton. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 898445 | | RESIDENT | LP2015803 | Site 45: Site 45 already has sheltered accommodation on one corner, the roads around the triangle are getting choked with traffic as it is and congestion with a school nearby and people taking shortcuts from the main roads and buses. Our field is enjoyed all year round with the younger footballers, many from the ethnic population and dog walkers on the outside edges. I did go to a drop-in event at Whitley Bay and was told 15 houses were earmarked from site 45. This has been our family home for 65 years. I say no. | Site 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The scope of the proposal does not relate to the existing sheltered housing units and would represent additional units on adjacent land.</p> <p>As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision.</p> <p>The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable.</p> | No amendments proposed. |
| 898341 | | | LP2015802 | Site 139: Along with hundreds of others I object to the proposed over-development of sites off Station Road and up to Whitley Road in Wallsend/Benton. The nationally devised housing needs assessment is not reflective of the reality in this borough. We DO NOT NEED all these new homes and, if the Darsley Park development is anything to go by, few locals could afford them anyway (with prices STARTING at over Â£280,000 for 'standard' buyers). Develop small scale brownfield sites and leave us SOME greenery. I have been fighting these proposals for over 5 years and they just keep coming back | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development.</p> <p>A number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | under a different name, but as another commentator has said, you will lose existing residents (the ones that actually PAY council tax) if you carry on ignoring public opinion. | | | prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 898445 | | RESIDENT | LP2015804 | New site: I personally think Bromley [avenue] greenfield would take a row of houses backing onto Appletree without losing a lot of the green. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Suggested noted. This site will be included in the next review of the SHLAA in order to be assessed for suitability and ultimately deliverability/developability for housing. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined in the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 468254 | | RESIDENT | LP2015806 | Site 17: At the previous consultation we wrote to you on behalf of the Northumberland and Newcastle Society pointing out the three areas in the borough where there is an urgent need to maintain strategic development buffers. In the current consultation two of these have been noted (Killingworth Moor and Murton) but the third ignored. This is the buffer between Benton and Wallsend. Sadly a large part of this has already been lost with the application to build east of | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | the A186 towards the Rising Sun. This makes it all the more important to retain Area 17 west of the A186 together with Area 111. It is worth noting that there is no such buffer further west in Newcastle "" Walker, Heaton and Longbenton are a continuous belt of housing right up to the Balliol Business Park, which again makes it more important. | | | | |
| 468254 | | RESIDENT | LP2015807 | Site 11 now Site E0101: At the previous consultation we wrote to you on behalf of the Northumberland and Newcastle Society pointing out the three areas in the borough where there is an urgent need to maintain strategic development buffers. In the current consultation two of these have been noted (Killingworth Moor and Murton) but the third ignored. This is the buffer between Benton and Wallsend. Sadly a large part of this has already been lost with the application to build east of the A186 towards the Rising Sun. This makes it all the more important to retain Area 17 west of the A186 together with Area 111. It is worth noting that there is no such buffer further west in Newcastle "" Walker, Heaton and Longbenton are a continuous belt of housing right up to the Balliol Business Park, which again makes it more important. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 468254 | | RESIDENT | LP2015809 | Site 128: I am writing to applaud the decision of the Council to protect the Benton Curve and adjoining field from | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | possible housing development which would be wholly inappropriate in this conservation area. Furthermore the curve is a valuable wildlife corridor greatly appreciated by local residents. | | Housing Development Sites | of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | |
| 468254 | | RESIDENT | LP2015810 | Site 14: I am writing to applaud the decision of the Council to protect the Benton Curve and adjoining field from possible housing development which would be wholly inappropriate in this conservation area. Furthermore the curve is a valuable wildlife corridor greatly appreciated by local residents. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898477 | | RESIDENT | LP2015812 | Site 45: We live on a large housing estate, which comprises mainly of family built homes "" with no adequate play areas for our children. The nearest is besides Morrisons, next to the Metro line, hidden away from public view, another is in Monkseaton at Churchill playing fields, or in Whitley Bay itself behind the Dome! Our children need a fenced off safe area with play equipment and an area for ball games; this grassed area already has a small "goal posts" erected for the children to play football. Local residents also take their dogs to this grassed area to let them have a run-about - not everyone has a car to travel to the beach or other park areas with their children or dogs. Another suggestion would be to incorporate some parking bays for the residents of Charlton Court (living accommodation for older people) and their carers/visitors. There is a bus | Site 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. The suggestion of improvements to existing open space will be considered including, if necessary, through the Local Plan process. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. Any need for additional resident/visitor parking for the existing accommodation will be reviewed if considered necessary. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>service running during the day which, with the lack of parking facilities can cause disruption to the service, but, mainly it would benefit the residents being able to park closer to the entrance of their flats (Baytree Gardens entrance). Building more houses on this site will cause more congestion as well as depriving our children of a local play area, which because of the houses that surround this grassed area a more safe environment is provided! Looking at the map provided Whitley Bay, Monkseaton and North Shields appear to be a densely populated area with very little green/open space areas on housing estates - other than the coast area. There already seems to be large sites already with permission across North Tyneside, but, Backworth, east Holywell, Howdon, Holy Cross, Wallsend, Killingworth, Seaton Burn and Dudley do appear to have more green/open spaces than our area! In this day and age of encouraging healthy living and plenty of exercise - keeping a green/open space area for outdoor activity is essential!!!</p> | | | | |
| 810020 | | RESIDENT | LP2015813 | <p>Site 52: Once again my wife and I must reiterate our strong objections to the possible use of the above mentioned land for residential use. This is a small greenfield site which has always been used by local residents both adults and children for generations for</p> | Site 52 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | recreational purposes. Central Govt/Local Govt. is always banging on about making sure that greenfield sites stay as they should green!! Traffic and parking is already a considerable problem in the area as elsewhere and the proposals would only add considerably to it. A planning application for sheltered housing on this very site some 4/5 years ago was turned down unanimously by the then planning committee and it was stated then that they would now never build on this site. Are we to be proven wrong I certainly hope not. | | | open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. | |
| 898477 | | RESIDENT | LP2015814 | New site: Alternatively could large grassed areas surrounding some schools that are not being used as a games/play area be considered for building smaller estate type housing (sheltered living accommodation has been built very close to Monkseaton School)? | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Each year the Council undertakes a review of the SHLAA, an assessment which identifies sites which are potentially suitable and developable for housing. This includes an annual review of Council-owned land as a priority, including any land that may be surplus to requirements. On review of the SHLAA any additional sites which meet this criteria will be identified and, if appropriate, considered for potential allocation. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 898219 | | | LP2015818 | New site: land @ the Cobalt; there is masses there. How about knocking down all the unused office blocks. Or brownfield sites near the Tyne. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, in Policy S7.3 (now 4.3), reflects this strategy and is followed by site-specific assessment, including consideration of the suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, to | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | select the range of suggested allocations. Cobalt Business Park (NT030) and the River Tyne North Bank area are allocated for employment purposes, reflected in the strategic Policy S5.1 (now S2.1) and then AS5.5 (now AS2.5) and AS5.6 (now AS2.6). As a result, these areas are generally not considered appropriate for residential development with the preferred focus being on economic and employment growth. | |
| 464454 | | RESIDENT | LP2015822 | Site 22 to 26: I also think that 2000 homes in Killingworth Moor is excessive what about other amenities i.e. schools, doctors, dentists they are already stretched. Again the roads in the area can't cope with more traffic. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable.</p> <p>Again through the Masterplan, the requirement for additional services and facilities will also be considered, including schools and healthcare provision. More generally, the importance of community services is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 898505 | | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP2015823 | <p>Site 29: My comments relate to your housing section reference S7.3 which contains a schedule of housing sites with housing number estimates. The site you refer to as Site 29 'Backworth Business Park and Cottages' relates to a site at Backworth which was in part a reclaimed mining site. The north/eastern part of the site is the subject of a current planning application by Northumberland Estates. The application has been under consideration by the Council for the last year for 65 residential units. The only issue of substance appears to be a problem with the measures necessary to manage the environment issues relating to a small industrial use (Keenan's). It is expected that Northumberland Estates will be successful over the next few months and they are likely to move to submit an application for additional housing on some of the adjacent land currently allocated for commercial/industrial uses. Furthermore my client's site 'Holywell Engineering' has been the subject of pre-planning discussion with the Council and has received positive responses from Council Officers. It has actually received permission for housing on the site but that permission has time expired as other options were under consideration (including a</p> | Site 29 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>This site is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment uses. In this, the Council is aware of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the overall site may have a potential capacity which would exceed the 65 units outlined in the Local Plan and relating to the recent planning application. However, this lower yield is a reflection of the proposed mixed-use allocation, with an emphasis on land-uses in addition to housing, and significant constraints to development. Therefore 65 dwellings is felt to be an appropriate total for allocation.</p> <p>The application in question (12/00637/FUL) was refused in May 2015 and it is apparent that there are still significant obstacles to delivery. These include the ecological site constraints and, principally, important issues relating to the operation of existing business which will need to be</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | 'Health Village'). Therefore the total capacity of the site for housing is likely to be in the order of 150 - 200 housing units rather than the 67 you have indicated in your plan. We would be grateful if you could amend your figures to reflect this position. | | | mitigated/overcome before development is acceptable. It is considered that a 65 units scheme, as part of a mixed-use allocation, is still possible for this wider site but deliverability in the short-term is questionable. | |
| 898341 | | | LP2015824 | Site 11 now Site E0101: Along with hundreds of others I object to the proposed over-development of sites off Station Road and up to Whitley Road in Wallsend/Benton. The nationally devised housing needs assessment is not reflective of the reality in this borough. We DO NOT NEED all these new homes and, if the Darsley Park development is anything to go by, few locals could afford them anyway (with prices STARTING at over £280,000 for 'standard' buyers). Develop small scale brownfield sites and leave us SOME greenery. I have been fighting these proposals for over 5 years and they just keep coming back under a different name, but as another commentator has said, you will lose existing residents (the ones that actually PAY council tax) if you carry on ignoring public opinion. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. A number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | sites. | |
| 898341 | | | LP2015825 | Site 17: Along with hundreds of others I object to the proposed over-development of sites off Station Road and up to Whitley Road in Wallsend/Benton. The nationally devised housing needs assessment is not reflective of the reality in this borough. We DO NOT NEED all these new homes and, if the Darsley Park development is anything to go by, few locals could afford them anyway (with prices STARTING at over £280,000 for 'standard' buyers). Develop small scale brownfield sites and leave us SOME greenery. I have been fighting these proposals for over 5 years and they just keep coming back under a different name, but as another commentator has said, you will lose existing residents (the ones that actually PAY council tax) if you carry on ignoring public opinion. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. A number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 898525 | | RESIDENT | LP2015826 | Site 142: While I understand that an increasing demand for homes within the borough necessitates identification of land for future housing | Site 142 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>development, I would suggest that the Site Reference 142 is inappropriate for this purpose. Not only are the houses on Front Street, opposite the proposed development, the last houses in Annitsford to enjoy a view of open fields but the land itself, with its mature trees and shrubs, provides a natural habitat for a variety of wild birds including several species on the RSPB's Red and Amber Lists "Birds of conservation concern". The land also provides an informal green space for dog walkers. This reduces the likelihood of dog fouling on public footpaths in general, with its attendant health hazards and clean-up costs, but more specifically, minimises the risk of this happening on the open planned grassed areas in front of houses on Front Street. Understandably, already being overlooked by houses to the rear and sides of my property, I'd also rather not have the front aspect of my house permanently overlooked by yet more houses. The road, B1505, is also an issue when considering development of Site 142. Though, perhaps officially unreported, there have been several traffic incidents on this road. Frequently used by motorists trying to avoid congestion on the A189, this is already quite a busy road as the latest of several traffic calming measures contest. Traffic can only increase with the opening of the new</p> | | Development Sites | <p>potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>This site has been selected as a suggested allocation following this process but any proposal for development will require a formal planning application, with the issues of visual, landscape and environmental impact having to be assessed and, if necessary, measures proposed to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site, this includes that related to wild birds and negative impacts from the adjacent A189.</p> <p>The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>emergency hospital at Cramlington later this year and the possibility of more motorists from the large development Site Reference 3 proposed in your Consultation plan. The potential hazard to residents, particularly children, crossing from houses on the proposed site to Front St. has to be obvious especially since the return journey might well require crossing from behind cars parked outside the general dealers and fast food outlets on Front Street. While details of the building line for the proposed development are not available, pollution, and its possible effects, from traffic on the A189 have also to be considered. Though there are already houses to the south of Site 142 and their occupants may be quite willing to live in such close proximity to this busy dual carriageway, any houses on the proposed development, especially the northern end, would be exposed to greater levels of pollution from stationary traffic queuing at traffic lights on the A189, particularly during rush hour periods. It's not a place I would want to live!</p> | | | | |
| 898546 | | | LP2015828 | <p>Site 128: The proposed 'wildlife corridor' at the disused railway in Benton is a good idea. Firstly, that area of railway may end up being reused for its original intention one day. This is one reason why it should not be built on now. In the meantime, it provides a</p> | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Support for designation noted. In a previous of the plan (LPCD 2013) this area was identified as safeguarded for strategic transport purposes, in order to retain the potential for a future rail connection. However, since then, Newcastle International Airport have confirmed that a</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | secluded area for wildlife to go. The airport may one day wish to reuse the land as a link between the mainline and the metro or for some similar purpose. I strongly support the use of the Benton curve as a wildlife corridor. | | | heavy rail connection is no longer an aspiration and want to explore alternative options for the site. In order that a safeguarding policy can be applied there has to be relative certainty with regard to deliverability within the plan period - this is no longer evident. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | |
| 898560 | | RESIDENT | LP2015830 | The new homes are badly needed. It's unrealistic to think growth can be achieved by using only brownfield land. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 898564 | | RESIDENT | LP2015832 | Site 35-41: We are against the Plan as we do not want more farm land used for housing and also Shiremoor is very congested with traffic already which will only get worse. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 898564 | | RESIDENT | LP2015833 | New site: There are plenty of brown field sites here and there, where you could put 12-20 houses each plot. The Beaumont. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. This site has been assessed through the SHLAA (Site 401) but is subject to a permitted application for a care home (C2 use) and therefore, at the recommending sites, it was considered that there was insufficient evidence of availability in order to justify a residential allocation. However, if this scheme is not progressed, the site may come forward for residential development in the plan period and could make a contribution to overall housing need. An allowance is made for these type of sites in the windfall projection figure. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| 898564 | | RESIDENT | LP2015834 | New site: There are plenty of brown field sites here and there, where you could put 12-20 houses each plot. Shiremoor Club. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. Suggested noted. This site will be included in the next review of the SHLAA in order to be assessed for suitability and ultimately deliverability/developability for housing. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 898564 | | RESIDENT | LP2015835 | New site: There are plenty of brown field sites here and there, where you could put 12-20 houses each plot. The Shiremoor Resource Centre. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. Suggested noted. This site will be included in the next review of the SHLAA in order to be assessed for suitability and ultimately deliverability/developability for housing. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 898564 | | RESIDENT | LP2015836 | I realise we need more housing but not at the cost of using farmland anywhere. We do not have enough to feed our country now. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>The Local Plan does not have any direct influence over the link between where food is produced and where it is consumed. However the importance of agricultural land in creating a sustainable future is recognised and the retention of the current Green Belt boundaries will ensure that significant tracts of productive agricultural land are protected from development over the plan period and beyond. Further evidence relating to agricultural land classification within the borough has been requested from Natural England.</p> | |
| 898572 | | | LP2015838 | <p>Site 139: I understand the need to build more houses but I urge the council to give more consideration to the communities of North Tyneside. This plan eradicates all of the greenfield sites between Benton and Wallsend which will effectively make the area one big urban sprawl. Please therefore think again about allowing housing on the remaining fields off Station Road / Whitley Road. Squeezing even more houses in this area will also lead to even more road congestion.</p> | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | |
| 898573 | | | LP2015839 | Site 14: I urge the council and planning officers to maintain the Wildlife corridors at Benton Curve and Benton triangle for the animals birds and plants that inhabit and use those areas. | Site 14 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898575 | | | LP2015841 | Site 35-41: I have serious concerns about the proposals for allowable development around Murton Village and adjacent to Rake Lane and Monkseaton. The plans indicate a buffer zone around Murton to prevent joining of existing communities, but what about the areas to the east (West Monkseaton) and west (New York / Shiremoor)? The character of these areas would be significantly altered (and not for the better) if development goes ahead in this area, particularly to the ridiculously large extent proposed. Once this valuable green space is gone it won't be replaced. One reason | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>people choose to live in Monkseaton is because of the proximity to green space. Do the politicians really think that increasing the density of development at the coast is going to maintain its desirability as a place to live, and all of the input to the local economy that this results in? There is a wide variety of wildlife, that does not fall into the "protected" bracket, that either visit or make their homes in this existing green space (not just the "wildlife corridor"!)). This includes foxes hedgehogs, amphibians, small mammals including voles, birds of prey including Sparrow Hawks, herons, curlews, pheasants, bats and many more. Building to the extent prosed in this area would destroy the balance currently in existence. Transport links (both road and public transport) connecting the coast to Newcastle City centre are already under pressure. Building more homes in this type of volume only makes the problem worse, and the local plan appears to ignore this east-West connection. Flood risk from surface water is already an issue in this area. Development on the scale proposed only places more pressure on an existing sewer network that is already stretched. Indeed, development on this scale makes a mockery of the need to obtain planning permission to pave a driveway. The local politicians</p> | | | <p>accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3)and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | evidently have no regard for the views of the people that they are supposed to represent, and seem to be simply "towing the party line". Very disappointing. | | | considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 898577 | | RESIDENT | LP2015842 | Site 139: I am very concerned about North Tyneside proposals to build houses on the remaining Benton greenfield sites, please don't let this happen. No more houses built on Benton's green field sites | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898577 | | RESIDENT | LP2015843 | Site 11 now Site E0101: I am very concerned about North Tyneside proposals to build houses on the remaining Benton greenfield sites, please don't let this happen. No more houses built on Benton's green field sites | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 898577 | | RESIDENT | LP2015844 | Site 17: I am very concerned about North Tyneside proposals to build houses on the remaining Benton greenfield sites, please don't let this happen. No more houses built on Benton's green field sites | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | |
| 898591 | | RESIDENT | LP2015849 | There appear to be numerous brown field sites within this region, would it not be possible to use them for any necessary future housing in preference to destroying the few green spaces we have left? | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 898589 | | RESIDENT | LP2015853 | Site 5: There is still a suggestion that certain sites may have alternative uses such as employment and or housing. Stephenson Industrial Estate on Great Lime Road is one such area. Because of the varying resultant land values, there is no incentive for these areas to remain as employment opportunities. I accept that they are not of the best quality, but they do provide a necessary source of cheap employment space which is likely to disappear to the detriment of the Borough. I would suggest that relocation to other areas, which are likely to be more expensive, is not an option for many of the users on these | Site 5 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This area of Killingworth is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. In this, the Council is aware of the role these sites play in providing a ready supply of employment land and of the needs and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | sites. | | | requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | |
| 898589 | | RESIDENT | LP2015855 | Site 6: There is still a suggestion that certain sites may have alternative uses such as employment and or housing. Stephenson Industrial Estate on Great Lime Road is one such area. Because of the varying resultant land values, there is no incentive for these areas to remain as employment opportunities. I accept that they are not of the best quality, but they do provide a necessary source of cheap employment space which is likely to disappear to the detriment of the Borough. I would suggest that relocation to other areas, which are likely to be more expensive, is not an option for many of the users on these sites. | Site 6 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This area of Killingworth is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. In this, the Council is aware of the role these sites play in providing a ready supply of employment land and of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) (now DM1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) (now 4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898589 | | RESIDENT | LP2015856 | Site 7: There is still a suggestion that certain sites may have alternative uses | Site 7 | S 7.3 Distribution of | This area of Killingworth is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | such as employment and or housing. Stephenson Industrial Estate on Great Lime Road is one such area. Because of the varying resultant land values, there is no incentive for these areas to remain as employment opportunities. I accept that they are not of the best quality, but they do provide a necessary source of cheap employment space which is likely to disappear to the detriment of the Borough. I would suggest that relocation to other areas, which are likely to be more expensive, is not an option for many of the users on these sites. | | Potential Housing Development Sites | Council's desire to develop a wider regeneration programme for the area. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. In this, the Council is aware of the role these sites play in providing a ready supply of employment land and of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | |
| 898629 | | RESIDENT | LP2015858 | Site 11 now Site E0101: I oppose the building on green land sites between Wallsend and Benton. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 898631 | | RESIDENT | LP2015861 | Site 2: I wish to lodge in the strongest possible terms an objection to the proposal for more housing in the Annitsford and Dudley areas. The highway infrastructure is in adequate to cope with additional traffic. Annitsford front street is used as a rat | Site 2 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | run during peak time with traffic avoiding Moor Farm roundabout. The Wyndings being a no through would be a disaster waiting to happen. Despite speed humps I see many close shaves especially, with children crossing particularly at school times. The road through Dudley is also extremely busy with Heavy Goods Vehicles going to Shasun, Fergusons and Owen Pugh's. If it is the Council's wish to have fatal accidents then additional housing is the way forward. To do so would be sheer madness. All the roads including the Broadlaw are single carriage ways and not all in the best of condition to be adding addition traffic. | | | network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For Dudley, including Grieves Row and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | |
| 898629 | | RESIDENT | LP2015859 | Site 17: I oppose the building on green land sites between Wallsend and Benton. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 898629 | | RESIDENT | LP2015860 | Site 139: I oppose the building on green land sites between Wallsend and Benton. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898631 | | RESIDENT | LP2015862 | Site 3: I wish to lodge in the strongest possible terms an objection to the proposal for more housing in the Annitsford and Dudley areas. The highway infrastructure is in adequate to cope with additional traffic. Annitsford front street is used as a rat | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | run during peak time with traffic avoiding Moor Farm roundabout. The Wyndings being a no through would be a disaster waiting to happen. Despite speed humps I see many close shaves especially, with children crossing particularly at school times. The road through Dudley is also extremely busy with Heavy Goods Vehicles going to Shasun, Fergusons and Owen Pugh's. If it is the Council's wish to have fatal accidents then additional housing is the way forward. To do so would be sheer madness. All the roads including the Broadlaw are single carriage ways and not all in the best of condition to be adding addition traffic. | | | network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For Annitsford Fm, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | |
| 898631 | | RESIDENT | LP2015863 | Site 142: I wish to lodge in the strongest possible terms an objection to the proposal for more housing in the Annitsford and Dudley areas. The highway infrastructure is in adequate to cope with additional traffic. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run during peak time with traffic avoiding Moor Farm roundabout. The Wyndings being a no through would be a disaster waiting to happen. Despite speed humps I see many close shaves especially, with children crossing particularly at school times. The road through Dudley is also extremely busy with Heavy Goods Vehicles going to Shasun, Fergusons and Owen Pugh's. If it is the Council's wish to have fatal accidents then additional housing is | Site 142 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | the way forward. To do so would be sheer madness. All the roads including the Broadlaw are single carriage ways and not all in the best of condition to be adding addition traffic. | | | | |
| 898631 | | RESIDENT | LP2015864 | Site 140: I wish to lodge in the strongest possible terms an objection to the proposal for more housing in the Annitsford and Dudley areas. The highway infrastructure is in adequate to cope with additional traffic. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run during peak time with traffic avoiding Moor Farm roundabout. The Wyndings being a no through would be a disaster waiting to happen. Despite speed humps I see many close shaves especially, with children crossing particularly at school times. The road through Dudley is also extremely busy with Heavy Goods Vehicles going to Shasun, Fergusons and Owen Pugh's. If it is the Council's wish to have fatal accidents then additional housing is the way forward. To do so would be sheer madness. All the roads including the Broadlaw are single carriage ways and not all in the best of condition to be adding addition traffic. | Site 140 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898631 | | RESIDENT | LP2015865 | Site 11 now Site E0108: I wish to lodge in the strongest possible terms an objection to the proposal for more housing in the Annitsford and Dudley areas. The highway infrastructure is in adequate to cope with additional traffic. Annitsford front street is used | Site 11 now Site E0108 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | as a rat run during peak time with traffic avoiding Moor Farm roundabout. The Wyndings being a no through would be a disaster waiting to happen. Despite speed humps I see many close shaves especially, with children crossing particularly at school times. The road through Dudley is also extremely busy with Heavy Goods Vehicles going to Shasun, Fergusons and Owen Pugh's. If it is the Council's wish to have fatal accidents then additional housing is the way forward. To do so would be sheer madness. All the roads including the Broadlaw are single carriage ways and not all in the best of condition to be adding addition traffic. | | | network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | |
| 898631 | | RESIDENT | LP2015866 | Site 143: I wish to lodge in the strongest possible terms an objection to the proposal for more housing in the Annitsford and Dudley areas. The highway infrastructure is in adequate to cope with additional traffic. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run during peak time with traffic avoiding Moor Farm roundabout. The Wyndings being a no through would be a disaster waiting to happen. Despite speed humps I see many close shaves especially, with children crossing particularly at school times. The road through Dudley is also extremely busy with Heavy Goods Vehicles going to Shasun, Fergusons and Owen Pugh's. If it is the Council's wish to have fatal | Site 143 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | accidents then additional housing is the way forward. To do so would be sheer madness. All the roads including the Broadlaw are single carriage ways and not all in the best of condition to be adding addition traffic. | | | | |
| 898631 | | RESIDENT | LP2015867 | Site 132: I wish to lodge in the strongest possible terms an objection to the proposal for more housing in the Annitsford and Dudley areas. The highway infrastructure is in adequate to cope with additional traffic. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run during peak time with traffic avoiding Moor Farm roundabout. The Wyndings being a no through would be a disaster waiting to happen. Despite speed humps I see many close shaves especially, with children crossing particularly at school times. The road through Dudley is also extremely busy with Heavy Goods Vehicles going to Shasun, Fergusons and Owen Pugh's. If it is the Council's wish to have fatal accidents then additional housing is the way forward. To do so would be sheer madness. All the roads including the Broadlaw are single carriage ways and not all in the best of condition to be adding addition traffic. | Site 132 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898631 | | RESIDENT | LP2015868 | Site 11 now Site E0109: I wish to lodge in the strongest possible terms an objection to the proposal for more housing in the Annitsford and Dudley areas. The highway infrastructure is in adequate to cope with additional | Site 11 now Site E0109 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>traffic. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run during peak time with traffic avoiding Moor Farm roundabout. The Wyndings being a no through would be a disaster waiting to happen. Despite speed humps I see many close shaves especially, with children crossing particularly at school times. The road through Dudley is also extremely busy with Heavy Goods Vehicles going to Shasun, Fergusons and Owen Pugh's. If it is the Council's wish to have fatal accidents then additional housing is the way forward. To do so would be sheer madness. All the roads including the Broadlaw are single carriage ways and not all in the best of condition to be adding addition traffic.</p> | | | <p>The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic.</p> | |
| 898636 | | RESIDENT | LP2015873 | <p>Site 17: I want to object to the council plans to allow green field land, adjacent to Whitley Road to be built upon for whatever purpose, be it housing or industrial. There is far to much building on green field sites already. What about the quality of life for people living near the area. There has always been a feeling of open space in this part of north Tyneside which is good for peoples wellbeing. I am also deeply concerned for the wildlife that will die or not even have the chance to live, as a result. Also the roads around here are far too congested already. It will cause increased stress to anyone travelling in</p> | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3)</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | the area as a consequence of increasing the population. The council should look after the people currently resident in North Tyneside and not be pressured by the Government or big business into taking action that will certainly be detrimental to the wellbeing of all who live here. | | | and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | |
| 467822 | | RESIDENT | LP2015870 | Old hotels that can be used as flats and the railway hotel need doing right. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. These include a number of former hotel sites in the coastal area. In addition, an allowance for small-sites and windfall development is made through the Local Plan, based on past trends and evidenced through the SHLAA, which provides a small proportion of the total housing requirement to 2032. These allowances include forecast of potential supply from conversion of existing premises such as hotels. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|--|---|---|
| 467822 | | RESIDENT | LP2015872 | We need caravan site on green land. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Current evidence, the North Tyneside GTAA (2014), indicates that there is no need for a permanent or transit site for the travelling community in the borough. Following national guidance, the Local Plan includes a criteria-based policy, DM7.15 (now DM4.12), to provide a basis for planning decisions. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 898636 | | RESIDENT | LP2015875 | Site 11 now Site E0101: I want to object to the council plans to allow green field land, adjacent to Whitley Road to be built upon for whatever purpose, be it housing or industrial. There is far too much building on green field sites already. What about the quality of life for people living near the area. There has always been a feeling of open space in this part of north Tyneside which is good for peoples wellbeing. I am also deeply concerned for the wildlife that will die or not even have the chance to live, as a result. Also the roads around here are far too congested already. It will cause increased stress to anyone travelling in the area as a consequence of increasing the population. The council should look after the people currently resident in North Tyneside and not be pressured by the Government or big business into taking action that will certainly be detrimental to the wellbeing of all who live here. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | |
| 898636 | | RESIDENT | LP2015876 | Site 139: I want to object to the council plans to allow green field land, adjacent to Whitley Road to be built upon for whatever purpose, be it housing or industrial. There is far too much building on green field sites already. What about the quality of life for people living near the area. There has always been a feeling of open space in this part of north Tyneside which is good for peoples wellbeing. I am also deeply concerned for the wildlife that will die or not even have the chance to live, as a result. Also the roads around here are far too congested already. It will cause increased stress to anyone travelling in the area as a consequence of increasing the population. The council should look after the people currently resident in North Tyneside and not be pressured by the Government or big business into taking action that will certainly be detrimental to the wellbeing of all who live here. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898636 | | RESIDENT | LP2015877 | Site 15: I want to object to the council plans to allow green field land, | Site 15 | S 7.3 Distribution of | The former St Bartholomew's Primary School is a brownfield site and has been | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | adjacent to Whitley Road to be built upon for whatever purpose, be it housing or industrial. There is far too much building on green field sites already. What about the quality of life for people living near the area. There has always been a feeling of open space in this part of north Tyneside which is good for peoples wellbeing. I am also deeply concerned for the wildlife that will die or not even have the chance to live, as a result. Also the roads around here are far too congested already. It will cause increased stress to anyone travelling in the area as a consequence of increasing the population. The council should look after the people currently resident in North Tyneside and not be pressured by the Government or big business into taking action that will certainly be detrimental to the wellbeing of all who live here. | | Potential Housing Development Sites | made available due to restructuring of school provision in the area. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | |
| 898642 | | RESIDENT | LP2015880 | Site 2: I wish to object very strongly to any further plans to increase new housing in the Annitsford and Dudley area. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run at peak times as traffic avoids Moor Farm roundabout. The Broadlaw is a single carriageway road and is also very busy at peak times. The road through Dudley is extremely busy already as heavy goods vehicles from Owen Pugh's ,Shasun ,and Ferguson's compete with everyday traffic for the single carriageway road. It is madness | Site 2 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For Grieves Row, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | to deliberately increase the traffic when the infrastructure can barely cope as it is. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. | | | resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | |
| 467822 | | RESIDENT | LP2015887 | Site 1: Chapelville, Brenkley Court, Seaton Burn: Some Caravans | Site 1 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Current evidence, the North Tyneside GTAA (2014), indicates that there is no need for a permanent or transit site for the travelling community in the borough. Following national guidance, the Local Plan includes a criteria-based policy, DM7.15 (now DM4.12), to provide a basis for planning decisions. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898642 | | RESIDENT | LP2015881 | Site 3: I wish to object very strongly to any further plans to increase new housing in the Annitsford and Dudley area. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run at peak times as traffic avoids Moor Farm roundabout. The Broadlaw is a single carriageway road and is also very busy at peak times. The road through Dudley is extremely busy already as heavy goods vehicles from Owen Pugh's ,Shasun ,and Ferguson's compete with everyday traffic for the single carriageway road. It is madness to deliberately increase the traffic when the infrastructure can barely cope as it is. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this Annitsford Farm, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 898642 | | RESIDENT | LP2015882 | Site 142: I wish to object very strongly to any further plans to increase new housing in the Annitsford and Dudley area. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run at peak times as traffic avoids Moor Farm roundabout. The Broadlaw is a single carriageway road and is also | Site 142 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3)and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | very busy at peak times. The road through Dudley is extremely busy already as heavy goods vehicles from Owen Pugh's ,Shasun ,and Ferguson's compete with everyday traffic for the single carriageway road. It is madness to deliberately increase the traffic when the infrastructure can barely cope as it is. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. | | | network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | |
| 898642 | | RESIDENT | LP2015883 | Site 140: I wish to object very strongly to any further plans to increase new housing in the Annitsford and Dudley area. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run at peak times as traffic avoids Moor Farm roundabout. The Broadlaw is a single carriageway road and is also very busy at peak times. The road through Dudley is extremely busy already as heavy goods vehicles from Owen Pugh's ,Shasun ,and Ferguson's compete with everyday traffic for the single carriageway road. It is madness to deliberately increase the traffic when the infrastructure can barely cope as it is. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. | Site 140 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898642 | | RESIDENT | LP2015884 | Site 11 now Site E0108: I wish to object very strongly to any further plans to increase new housing in the Annitsford and Dudley area. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run at peak times as traffic avoids Moor Farm roundabout. The Broadlaw is a single carriageway road and is also very busy at peak times. The road through | Site 11 now Site E0108 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | Dudley is extremely busy already as heavy goods vehicles from Owen Pugh's ,Shasun ,and Ferguson's compete with everyday traffic for the single carriageway road. It is madness to deliberately increase the traffic when the infrastructure can barely cope as it is. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. | | | and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | |
| 898642 | | RESIDENT | LP2015885 | Site 143: I wish to object very strongly to any further plans to increase new housing in the Annitsford and Dudley area. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run at peak times as traffic avoids Moor Farm roundabout. The Broadlaw is a single carriageway road and is also very busy at peak times. The road through Dudley is extremely busy already as heavy goods vehicles from Owen Pugh's ,Shasun ,and Ferguson's compete with everyday traffic for the single carriageway road. It is madness to deliberately increase the traffic when the infrastructure can barely cope as it is. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. | Site 143 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898642 | | RESIDENT | LP2015886 | Site 132: I wish to object very strongly to any further plans to increase new housing in the Annitsford and Dudley area. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run at peak times as traffic avoids Moor Farm roundabout. The Broadlaw is a single carriageway road and is also very busy at peak times. The road through Dudley is extremely busy already as heavy goods vehicles from | Site 132 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | Owen Pugh's ,Shasun ,and Ferguson's compete with everyday traffic for the single carriageway road. It is madness to deliberately increase the traffic when the infrastructure can barely cope as it is. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. | | | order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | |
| 898642 | | RESIDENT | LP2015888 | Site 11 now Site E0109: I wish to object very strongly to any further plans to increase new housing in the Annitsford and Dudley area. Annitsford front street is used as a rat run at peak times as traffic avoids Moor Farm roundabout. The Broadlaw is a single carriageway road and is also very busy at peak times. The road through Dudley is extremely busy already as heavy goods vehicles from Owen Pugh's ,Shasun ,and Ferguson's compete with everyday traffic for the single carriageway road. It is madness to deliberately increase the traffic when the infrastructure can barely cope as it is. It is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. | Site 11 now Site E0109 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For this site, and the wider area, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network and the flow of HGV traffic. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 805010 | | RESIDENT | LP2015912 | Site 17: I wish to register my opposition to any more developments on green fields in my area. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 805010 | | RESIDENT | LP2015913 | Site 11 now Site E0101: I wish to register my opposition to any more developments on green fields in my area. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 805010 | | RESIDENT | LP2015914 | Site 139: I wish to register my opposition to any more developments on green fields in my area. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898831 | | RESIDENT | LP2015940 | Site 15: A high proportion of the proposed sites are in a small | Site 15 | S 7.3 Distribution of | The former St Bartholomew's Primary School is a brownfield site and has been | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>concentrated area where large sites with planning permission already exist. Roads are already overcrowded, natural boundaries between areas will be lost e.g. Benton will merge with Wallsend. Please leave existing green areas alone. If you must build please use brownfield sites only, preferably within easy access of major traffic dispersal. Roads such as the A19. Sites 27 and 28 are close to the A19. There is an already disproportionate amount of development in and around the former 'villages' of Benton and Forest Hall compared to other parts. In the Borough of North Tyneside. The 'Consultation ' of November 2013, compared to the 'Consultation ' of February 2015, shows huge changes in the areas of Murton Village and Killingworth Moor, you state that this is in part to protect the Identity of Murton Village and to prevent Killingworth, Palmersville and Forest Hall merging, where in your plan is protection for the Benton Area? In fact compared to the 2013 , 2015's shows large additions in the Benton Area- Areas 111 and 139. Please address this imbalance and stop any further development in and around the Benton Area.</p> | | Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>made available due to restructuring of school provision in the area.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> <p>The proposed delivery from both Site 27 and Site 28 is currently forecast to contribute towards meeting overall requirement for new homes in the borough.</p> | |
| 898831 | | RESIDENT | LP2015941 | <p>Site 17: A high proportion of the proposed sites are in a small concentrated area where large sites with planning permission already exist. Roads are already overcrowded, natural boundaries between areas will be lost e.g. Benton will merge with Wallsend. Please leave existing green areas alone. If you must build please use brownfield sites only, preferably within easy access of major traffic dispersal. Roads such as the A19. Sites 27 and 28 are close to the A19. There is an already disproportionate amount of development in and around the former 'villages' of Benton and Forest Hall compared to other parts. In the Borough of North Tyneside. The 'Consultation ' of November 2013, compared to the 'Consultation ' of</p> | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | February 2015, shows huge changes in the areas of Murton Village and Killingworth Moor, you state that this is in part to protect the Identity of Murton Village and to prevent Killingworth, Palmersville and Forest Hall merging, where in your plan is protection for the Benton Area? In fact compared to the 2013 , 2015's shows large additions in the Benton Area- Areas 111 and 139. Please address this imbalance and stop any further development in and around the Benton Area. | | | existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The proposed delivery from both Site 27 and Site 28 is currently forecast to contribute towards meeting overall requirement for new homes in the borough. | |
| 898831 | | RESIDENT | LP2015942 | Site 11 now Site E0101: A high proportion of the proposed sites are in a small concentrated area where large sites with planning permission already exist. Roads are already overcrowded, natural boundaries between areas will | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>be lost e.g. Benton will merge with Wallsend. Please leave existing green areas alone. If you must build please use brownfield sites only, preferably within easy access of major traffic dispersal. Roads such as the A19. Sites 27 and 28 are close to the A19. There is an already disproportionate amount of development in and around the former 'villages' of Benton and Forest Hall compared to other parts. In the Borough of North Tyneside. The 'Consultation ' of November 2013, compared to the 'Consultation ' of February 2015, shows huge changes in the areas of Murton Village and Killingworth Moor, you state that this is in part to protect the Identity of Murton Village and to prevent Killingworth, Palmersville and Forest Hall merging, where in your plan is protection for the Benton Area? In fact compared to the 2013 , 2015's shows large additions in the Benton Area- Areas 111 and 139. Please address this imbalance and stop any further development in and around the Benton Area.</p> | | | <p>year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> <p>The proposed delivery from both Site 27 and Site 28 is currently forecast to contribute towards meeting overall requirement for new homes in the borough.</p> | |
| 898831 | | RESIDENT | LP2015943 | <p>Site 139: A high proportion of the proposed sites are in a small concentrated area where large sites with planning permission already exist. Roads are already overcrowded, natural boundaries between areas will be lost e.g. Benton will merge with Wallsend. Please leave existing green areas alone. If you must build please use brownfield sites only, preferably within easy access of major traffic dispersal. Roads such as the A19. Sites 27 and 28 are close to the A19. There is an already disproportionate amount of development in and around the former 'villages' of Benton and Forest Hall compared to other parts. In the Borough of North Tyneside. The 'Consultation ' of November 2013, compared to the 'Consultation ' of February 2015, shows huge changes in the areas of Murton Village and Killingworth Moor, you state that this is in part to protect the Identity of Murton Village and to prevent Killingworth, Palmersville and Forest Hall merging, where in your plan is</p> | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | protection for the Benton Area? In fact compared to the 2013 , 2015's shows large additions in the Benton Area- Areas 111 and 139. Please address this imbalance and stop any further development in and around the Benton Area. | | | improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The proposed delivery from both Site 27 and Site 28 is currently forecast to contribute towards meeting overall requirement for new homes in the borough. | |
| 805083 | | RESIDENT | LP2015947 | I dispute the need for development on this scale strongly. Why do we have to make this decision now. Areas for development that could be used. The large green spaces where the grass is cut regular and are life less. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA, including assessing the most appropriate greenfield sites which may be surplus to requirements. From this assessment the most suitable sites have been selected for potential allocation. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 898848 | | RESIDENT | LP2015949 | Site 17: These are the last green spaces left between Benton, Wallsend and Palmersville which keep their identities separate. They also compliment the Rising Sun Country Park Nature Reserve, Providing a realistic Wildlife Corridor and Habitat. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 898848 | | RESIDENT | LP2015950 | Site 11 now Site E0101: These are the last green spaces left between Benton, Wallsend and Palmersville which keep their identities separate. They also compliment the Rising Sun Country Park Nature Reserve, providing a realistic Wildlife Corridor and Habitat. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 898848 | | RESIDENT | LP2015951 | Site 139: These are the last green spaces left between Benton, Wallsend and Palmersville which keep their identities separate. They also compliment the Rising Sun Country Park Nature Reserve, providing a realistic Wildlife Corridor and Habitat. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|------------|--|--|--|
| 898848 | | RESIDENT | LP2015952 | Site 139: These are the last green spaces left between Benton, Wallsend and Palmersville which keep their identities separate. They also compliment the Rising Sun Country Park Nature Reserve, providing a realistic Wildlife Corridor and Habitat. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. |
| 587121 | Nexus | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015968 | Site 120: In terms of Nexus' developable landholdings in the borough, we welcome the addition of our site to the south side of Benton Station, and the retention of our sites at Hylton Street and North Shields Station, all with a "'housing' designation. | Site 120 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). | No amendments proposed. |
| 587121 | Nexus | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015969 | Site 71: In terms of Nexus' developable landholdings in the borough, we welcome the addition of our site to the south side of Benton Station, and the retention of our sites at Hylton Street and North Shields Station, all with a "'housing' designation. | Site 71 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). | No amendments proposed. |
| 587121 | Nexus | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015970 | Site 66: In terms of Nexus' developable landholdings in the borough, we welcome the addition of our site to the south side of Benton Station, and the retention of our sites at Hylton Street and North Shields Station, all with a "'housing' designation. | Site 66 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). | No amendments proposed. |
| 898912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015977 | Site 35-41: Development sites are proposed which, I am told, are | Site 35 to | S 7.3 Distribution of | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | contrary to planning policy. For example part of sites 35-41 is to provide ecological compensation for a development elsewhere in the borough. | 41 | Potential Housing Development Sites | prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site. | solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151007 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151014 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151023 | As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links.</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|--|---|--|
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151030 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 898572 | | | LP20151049 | Site 11 now Site E0101: I understand the need to build more houses but I urge the council to give more consideration to the communities of North Tyneside. This plan eradicates all | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | of the greenfield sites between Benton and Wallsend which will effectively make the area one big urban sprawl. Please therefore think again about allowing housing on the remaining fields off Station Road / Whitley Road. Squeezing even more houses in this area will also lead to even more road congestion. | | Sites | development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | open space. |
| 898572 | | | LP20151050 | Site 17: I understand the need to build more houses but I urge the council to give more consideration to the communities of North Tyneside. This plan eradicates all of the greenfield sites between Benton and Wallsend which will effectively make the area one big urban sprawl. Please therefore | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | think again about allowing housing on the remaining fields off Station Road / Whitley Road. Squeezing even more houses in this area will also lead to even more road congestion. | | | between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | |
| 898573 | | | LP20151052 | I urge the council and planning officers to maintain the Wildlife corridors at Benton Curve and Benton triangle for the animals birds and plants that inhabit and use those areas. | Site 14 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | Amendment will be needed to reflect the final decision on site |
| 898573 | | | LP20151054 | Site 11 now Site E0101: I also urge you to keep the green spaces between Benton and North Wallsend along the | Site 11 now | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | A191 and Station Road to create a distinct gap that can be used for recreation and wildlife | Site E0101 | Housing Development Sites | Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 898573 | | | LP20151055 | Site 17: I also urge you to keep the green spaces between Benton and North Wallsend along the A191 and Station Road to create a distinct gap that can be used for recreation and wildlife | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 898751 | | | LP20151058 | Site 17: Myself and my family strongly and vehemently object to the use of greenfield sites for the building of houses. We object to the loss of vital green spaces that contribute to the well being of the population of North Tyneside. Losing green spaces has an incredibly detrimental effect on the physical and mental health of the population. Also, the damage to wildlife is totally unforgivable. We have already destroyed so many habitats of our native animals, birds and insects and this damage is irreversible. We our destroying the environment around us. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | <p>Finally, the extra pressures new housing puts on roads and amenities has not been properly planned for. Recently, new houses have been built behind Blue Flames and next to Whitley Road. As in all other recent developments in North Tyneside, these houses are incredibly ugly and built in highly inefficient way. Houses are built a foot apart so they can be sold as 'Detached' even though this is a complete waste of building materials. They are given small gardens, and there is very little green area included in the plans. Not only are houses being built in the wrong areas, they are very badly designed and poorly planned. We would like to specifically object to the plans to build houses near the Rising Sun Country Park for all the reasons listed above.</p> | | | <p>tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The importance of community services is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. The Local Plan includes a range of policies to deliver new development which is attractively designed, including Policy DM9.1 (nowDM6.1).</p> | |
| 898751 | | | LP20151059 | <p>Site 11 now Site E0101: Myself and my family strongly and vehemently object to the use of greenfield sites for the building of houses. We object to the loss of vital green spaces that contribute to the well being of the population of North Tyneside. Losing green spaces has an incredibly detrimental effect on the physical and</p> | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>mental health of the population. Also, the damage to wildlife is totally unforgivable. We have already destroyed so many habitats of our native animals, birds and insects and this damage is irreversible. We are destroying the environment around us. Finally, the extra pressures new housing puts on roads and amenities has not been properly planned for. Recently, new houses have been built behind Blue Flames and next to Whitley Road. As in all other recent developments in North Tyneside, these houses are incredibly ugly and built in a highly inefficient way. Houses are built a foot apart so they can be sold as 'Detached' even though this is a complete waste of building materials. They are given small gardens, and there is very little green area included in the plans. Not only are houses being built in the wrong areas, they are very badly designed and poorly planned. We would like to specifically object to the plans to build houses near the Rising Sun Country Park for all the reasons listed above.</p> | | | <p>wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The importance of community services is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. The Local Plan includes a range of policies to deliver new development which is attractively designed, including Policy DM9.2 (now DM6.2).</p> | |
| 793982 | | | LP20151061 | <p>Objection - Site 17. I was extremely disappointed that the Secretary of State chose to ignore the concerns</p> | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>raised by the residents and the council about granting permission to Persimmon Homes to build on the field of Station Road. I am also very concerned to see that the remaining green fields in this area (sites 17, 110, 139), have all been hallmarked for further development. Much apart from my sadness at seeing the natural habitat of a large range of wildlife (rabbits, deer and foxes) destroyed, in formerly industrialised areas such as Wallsend, green space is very, very precious. We also simply do not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic that this will bring onto Whitley Road and Station Road, let alone the impact on the surrounding roads. For example, the levels of traffic on Mullen Road at school drop off and pick up time (there are three schools within a half mile stretch) are already at very dangerous levels and it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. I feel that building additional homes along the remainder of Station Road without upgrading the infrastructure would be very irresponsible of the council and put the lives of residents (new and old) at considerable risk. Once again, I encourage the planning department to 'think outside of the box' revisiting brown field sites and rebuilding in those areas, this has been done with great success by neighbouring</p> | | Housing Development Sites | <p>Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Impacts on the local highway network, such as Mullen Rd, will also have to be considered. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1).A comprehensive assessment of</p> | <p>indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>communities, for example the Byker Wall which levelled old private houses and built new ones, or St Anne's Quay also in Byker which demolished old buildings to build brand new apartments. This has also been done on Wiltshire Drive, when old maisonettes were demolished and replaced with new houses. I moved into North Tyneside over 12 years ago and I absolutely love living here. I particularly chose where I live in Hadrian Lodge West due to the easy access to the fields and Rising Sun Country Park. I must confess the thought of living in a sprawling housing estate that stretches from the Coast Road to Whitley Road and having to queue in endless traffic every time I want to go somewhere is not very appealing. I genuinely hope that the council will be able to pursue their ambitious development plans for the benefit of everyone in North Tyneside without building on anymore green belt land in Wallsend or adding to the existing congestion issues.</p> | | | <p>potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> | |
| 793982 | | | LP20151062 | <p>Objection - Site 11 now Site E010 I was extremely disappointed that the Secretary of State chose to ignore the concerns raised by the residents and the council about granting permission to Persimmon Homes to build on the field of Station Road. I am also very concerned to see that the remaining green fields in this area (sites 17, 110,</p> | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>139), have all been hallmarked for further development. Much apart from my sadness at seeing the natural habitat of a large range of wildlife (rabbits, deer and foxes) destroyed, in formerly industrialised areas such as Wallsend, green space is very, very precious. We also simply do not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic that this will bring onto Whitley Road and Station Road, let alone the impact on the surrounding roads. For example, the levels of traffic on Mullen Road at school drop off and pick up time (there are three schools within a half mile stretch) are already at very dangerous levels and it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. I feel that building additional homes along the remainder of Station Road without upgrading the infrastructure would be very irresponsible of the council and put the lives of residents (new and old) at considerable risk. Once again, I encourage the planning department to 'think outside of the box' revisiting brown field sites and rebuilding in those areas, this has been done with great success by neighbouring communities, for example the Byker Wall which levelled old private houses and built new ones, or St Anne's Quay also in Byker which demolished old buildings to build brand new apartments. This has also been done</p> | | | <p>wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Impacts on the local highway network, such as Mullen Rd, will also have to be considered. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | on Wiltshire Drive, when old maisonettes were demolished and replaced with new houses. I moved into North Tyneside over 12 years ago and I absolutely love living here. I particularly chose where I live in Hadrian Lodge West due to the easy access to the fields and Rising Sun Country Park. I must confess the thought of living in a sprawling housing estate that stretches from the Coast Road to Whitley Road and having to queue in endless traffic every time I want to go somewhere is not very appealing. I genuinely hope that the council will be able to pursue their ambitious development plans for the benefit of everyone in North Tyneside without building on anymore green belt land in Wallsend or adding to the existing congestion issues. | | | the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 793982 | | | LP20151063 | Objection - Site 139 I was extremely disappointed that the Secretary of State chose to ignore the concerns raised by the residents and the council about granting permission to Persimmon Homes to build on the field of Station Road. I am also very concerned to see that the remaining green fields in this area (sites 17, 110, 139), have all been hallmarked for further development. Much apart from my sadness at seeing the natural habitat of a large range of wildlife (rabbits, deer and foxes) destroyed, in formerly industrialised areas such as | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Wallsend, green space is very, very precious. We also simply do not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic that this will bring onto Whitley Road and Station Road, let alone the impact on the surrounding roads. For example, the levels of traffic on Mullen Road at school drop off and pick up time (there are three schools within a half mile stretch) are already at very dangerous levels and it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. I feel that building additional homes along the remainder of Station Road without upgrading the infrastructure would be very irresponsible of the council and put the lives of residents (new and old) at considerable risk. Once again, I encourage the planning department to 'think outside of the box' revisiting brown field sites and rebuilding in those areas, this has been done with great success by neighbouring communities, for example the Byker Wall which levelled old private houses and built new ones, or St Anne's Quay also in Byker which demolished old buildings to build brand new apartments. This has also been done on Wiltshire Drive, when old maisonettes were demolished and replaced with new houses. I moved into North Tyneside over 12 years ago and I absolutely love living here. I particularly chose where I live in</p> | | | <p>tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Impacts on the local highway network, such as Mullen Rd, will also have to be considered. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now DM1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | Hadrian Lodge West due to the easy access to the fields and Rising Sun Country Park. I must confess the thought of living in a sprawling housing estate that stretches from the Coast Road to Whitley Road and having to queue in endless traffic every time I want to go somewhere is not very appealing. I genuinely hope that the council will be able to pursue their ambitious development plans for the benefit of everyone in North Tyneside without building on anymore green belt land in Wallsend or adding to the existing congestion issues. | | | | |
| 899144 | | RESIDENT | LP20151064 | Objection - Site 17 I was extremely disappointed that the Secretary of State chose to ignore the concerns raised by the residents and the council about granting permission to Persimmon Homes to build on the field of Station Road. I am also very concerned to see that the remaining green fields in this area (sites 17, 110, 139), have all been hallmarked for further development. Much apart from my sadness at seeing the natural habitat of a large range of wildlife (rabbits, deer and foxes) destroyed, in formerly industrialised areas such as Wallsend, green space is very, very precious. We also simply do not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic that this will bring onto Whitley Road and Station Road, let alone the impact on the | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>surrounding roads. For example, the levels of traffic on Mullen Road at school drop off and pick up time (there are three schools within a half mile stretch) are already at very dangerous levels and it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. I feel that building additional homes along the remainder of Station Road without upgrading the infrastructure would be very irresponsible of the council and put the lives of residents (new and old) at considerable risk. Once again, I encourage the planning department to 'think outside of the box' revisiting brown field sites and rebuilding in those areas, this has been done with great success by neighbouring communities, for example the Byker Wall which levelled old private houses and built new ones, or St Anne's Quay also in Byker which demolished old buildings to build brand new apartments. This has also been done on Wiltshire Drive, when old maisonettes were demolished and replaced with new houses. I moved into North Tyneside over 12 years ago and I absolutely love living here. I particularly chose where I live in Hadrian Lodge West due to the easy access to the fields and Rising Sun Country Park. I must confess the thought of living in a sprawling housing estate that stretches from the Coast Road to Whitley Road and having to</p> | | | <p>assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Impacts on the local highway network, such as Mullen Rd, will also have to be considered. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now DM1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | queue in endless traffic every time I want to go somewhere is not very appealing. I genuinely hope that the council will be able to pursue their ambitious development plans for the benefit of everyone in North Tyneside without building on anymore green belt land in Wallsend or adding to the existing congestion issues. | | | | |
| 899144 | | RESIDENT | LP20151066 | Objection - Site 139 I was extremely disappointed that the Secretary of State chose to ignore the concerns raised by the residents and the council about granting permission to Persimmon Homes to build on the field of Station Road. I am also very concerned to see that the remaining green fields in this area (sites 17, 110, 139), have all been hallmarked for further development. Much apart from my sadness at seeing the natural habitat of a large range of wildlife (rabbits, deer and foxes) destroyed, in formerly industrialised areas such as Wallsend, green space is very, very precious. We also simply do not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic that this will bring onto Whitley Road and Station Road, let alone the impact on the surrounding roads. For example, the levels of traffic on Mullen Road at school drop off and pick up time (there are three schools within a half mile stretch) are already at very dangerous levels and it is only a matter of time | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>before there is a serious accident. I feel that building additional homes along the remainder of Station Road without upgrading the infrastructure would be very irresponsible of the council and put the lives of residents (new and old) at considerable risk. Once again, I encourage the planning department to 'think outside of the box' revisiting brown field sites and rebuilding in those areas, this has been done with great success by neighbouring communities, for example the Byker Wall which levelled old private houses and built new ones, or St Anne's Quay also in Byker which demolished old buildings to build brand new apartments. This has also been done on Wiltshire Drive, when old maisonettes were demolished and replaced with new houses. I moved into North Tyneside over 12 years ago and I absolutely love living here. I particularly chose where I live in Hadrian Lodge West due to the easy access to the fields and Rising Sun Country Park. I must confess the thought of living in a sprawling housing estate that stretches from the Coast Road to Whitley Road and having to queue in endless traffic every time I want to go somewhere is not very appealing. I genuinely hope that the council will be able to pursue their ambitious development plans for the benefit of everyone in North Tyneside</p> | | | <p>Road East. Impacts on the local highway network, such as Mullen Rd, will also have to be considered. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now DM1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | without building on anymore green belt land in Wallsend or adding to the existing congestion issues. | | | | |
| 899144 | | RESIDENT | LP20151065 | <p>Objection - Site 11 now Site E010 I was extremely disappointed that the Secretary of State chose to ignore the concerns raised by the residents and the council about granting permission to Persimmon Homes to build on the field of Station Road. I am also very concerned to see that the remaining green fields in this area (sites 17, 110, 139), have all been hallmarked for further development. Much apart from my sadness at seeing the natural habitat of a large range of wildlife (rabbits, deer and foxes) destroyed, in formerly industrialised areas such as Wallsend, green space is very, very precious. We also simply do not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic that this will bring onto Whitley Road and Station Road, let alone the impact on the surrounding roads. For example, the levels of traffic on Mullen Road at school drop off and pick up time (there are three schools within a half mile stretch) are already at very dangerous levels and it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. I feel that building additional homes along the remainder of Station Road without upgrading the infrastructure would be very irresponsible of the council and put the lives of residents (new and old)</p> | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes and proposals relating to the A191 corridor. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road/East Benton Farm area, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Impacts on the local highway network, such as Mullen Rd, will also have to be considered. Additional improvements will be promoted to ensure impacts on the transport network are mitigated, including continued promotion of sustainable travel</p> | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>at considerable risk. Once again, I encourage the planning department to 'think outside of the box' revisiting brown field sites and rebuilding in those areas, this has been done with great success by neighbouring communities, for example the Byker Wall which levelled old private houses and built new ones, or St Anne's Quay also in Byker which demolished old buildings to build brand new apartments. This has also been done on Wiltshire Drive, when old maisonettes were demolished and replaced with new houses. I moved into North Tyneside over 12 years ago and I absolutely love living here. I particularly chose where I live in Hadrian Lodge West due to the easy access to the fields and Rising Sun Country Park. I must confess the thought of living in a sprawling housing estate that stretches from the Coast Road to Whitley Road and having to queue in endless traffic every time I want to go somewhere is not very appealing. I genuinely hope that the council will be able to pursue their ambitious development plans for the benefit of everyone in North Tyneside without building on anymore green belt land in Wallsend or adding to the existing congestion issues.</p> | | | <p>including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now DM1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> | |
| 805563 | | | LP20151077 | Site 14: I am pleased to see that site 14, land to the rear of Midhurst Road in Benton, is no longer designated as | Site 14 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account | Amendment will be needed to reflect the final decision on site |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | potentially to be developed for housing. This recognises both the importance of the site as an area of local green space and the numerous technical issues (identified in several responses to the first) that make it unsuitable for housing development. | | Housing Development Sites | of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | |
| 899221 | | | LP20151079 | Site 14: It is excellent to see that site 14 has been removed from the list of potential development sites. | Site 14 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | Amendment will be needed to reflect the final decision on site |
| 792500 | | | LP20151083 | Site 14: We are very happy that this area has been removed from the Local Plan - it is a totally impractical area of land to be used for housing, there is massive local community support to not only preserve this land but to be able to utilise it - as it has been in the recent past until quite recently - by way of allotments and community space and we have demonstrated this by gaining over 110 local names on a petition of support in an application for Designated Green Space and the forming of the Benton Triangle Community Action Group. see us on www.betontriangle.com Therefore we wish to express our strong support for the permanent removal of the land at the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton from the list of potential development sites and its retention as an official | Site 14 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | Amendment will be needed to reflect the final decision on site |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | designated Green Space. " | | | | |
| 805543 | | | LP20151086 | Council members should hold their heads in shame at the disgraceful decision to build on green belt land at Station Road East [NTC: A planning application was submitted for housing on this site, which is not designated as Green Belt land. It was refused planning consent by North Tyneside Planning Committee, but this decision was appealed by the developer. The appeal was allowed, and consent granted, by a Government Planning Inspector in December 2014]. Now plot 17 is also up for grabs. No doubt this will be built upon and we all know why. The wildlife corridor here has been destroyed but is still displayed on the overall map. Shame on you again. The council policy of "Let's cover North Tyneside with bricks" still applies. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Station Road East - North Tyneside Council Planning Committee refused planning permission for this site. Subsequently, the developer appealed this decision and, following a report by an independent Inspector, the Secretary of State overturned the decision and allowed the application. This site now has planning permission for 650 homes, delivery from which will contribute towards the overall housing requirement for the borough of the plan period. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 899290 | | | LP20151120 | Site 14: I see site 14 has been removed from the list. I hope common sense has prevailed and this site is to be kept as a green space. | Site 14 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | Amendment will be needed to reflect the final decision on site |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151132 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a | Site 35 to | S 7.3 Distribution of | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | 41 | Potential Housing Development Sites | prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151138 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | | | identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151147 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151153 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 899352 | Left City | | LP20151163 | Site 61: Comment Site 61 is located at the Eastern edge of North Shields Town Centre and is identified as having the potential to provide 41 homes. North Shields Retail Centre Regeneration Strategy 2010 (NSRCRS) referenced in 6.37 of the LPCD 2015 proposes the redevelopment of the site for mixed commercial office and residential development. The proposal is for 68 flats and 1680sq.m of commercial office. Future retail demand has been identified in S6.3 of the LPCD 2015 with a clear preference for town centre locations. Conclusion The site's position in North Shields Town Centre makes it suitable within the context of the LPCD 2015 for residential use as defined in S7.3 but equally suitable for Commercial Office or Retail use as defined in S6.3. The LPCD 2015 Policies Map should define | Site 61 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Council is keen to promote the reuse of brownfield land in town centres and the Local Plan looks to focus development within the main urban area. However, the need to deliver new homes is not looked at in isolation and Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) aims to pursue growth and regeneration of town centres by delivering new development, but only when this is appropriate and not detrimental to existing circumstances. Whilst the current proposal is for housing, consideration will be given as to whether a mixed-use allocation would be more appropriate. In such a case, proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and retail uses. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | the scope of suitable uses on this site rather than prescribe its future use as residential. | | | | |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151165 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151170 | Site 35-41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy | Site 35 to | S 7.3 Distribution of | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | 41 | Potential Housing Development Sites | prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151179 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | | | identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151184 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 804890 | | RESIDENT | LP20151186 | Ref site 14 (rear of Midhurst Road, Benton), I am very pleased to see that this is no longer on the list as suitable for housing development. I hope that the local community group (Benton Triangle) set up to find alternative uses for the land will have the support of the council. | Site 14 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151193 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | Murton would significantly add to this problem. | | | measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151199 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links.</p> | considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151207 | <p>Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem.</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151211 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151221 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151238 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151241 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | | Housing Development Sites | site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 804857 | | | LP20151249 | I strongly object to the mass development of Killingworth Moor. As a resident of Simonside Park I am horrified at the prospect of up to a potential of 2000 new homes plus retail and schools etc. This farm land is the last open space before the greenbelt land which borders | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Concept Plan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, has been prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>Northumberland and a fair amount of this should continue to be protected to ensure that North Tyneside does not become one mass housing estate with an odd field here and there between. There are a few public footpaths across the moor which are popular with families and dog walkers alike, they will become nothing more than glorified footpaths through a large housing estate if these proposals go ahead. There is insufficient transport links for this area too - so unless North Tyneside Council can work with Nexus to branch a metro line up to Killingworth from Palmersville then everyone will be needing to use their cars to go anywhere. I live off Simonside way and it is already difficult to turn right out of the junction onto the B1317 with the speed and volume of traffic during peak periods. The B1317 will become a very busy road which will see mass congestion onto the already congested Great Lime Road. Or in the other direction people heading through Backworth towards the A19 (which is also already congested in both directions during peak periods). Even with the proposed new roadways marked on the map, they are still feeding into the same congested Great Lime Road and A19. If North Tyneside need to use some of the land for housing this should be kept at a minimum and ensure that the area</p> | | | <p>suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. This will include consideration of potential impacts on Great Lime Rd and the B1317.</p> <p>The Council currently working with Nexus in order to identify the improvements to the public transport network necessary to deliver the Local Plan, this includes opportunities for potential Metro extensions and new stations. Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) sets out the overall strategic approach to transport improvements. The importance of community services, including schools, is reflected in Policies</p> | <p>wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>does not then become completely urban. There is already 127 houses granted for the old army land and that is taking up a fair amount of the current farm land too - therefore 2000 houses plus retail and schools will change the whole face of the area into a mass area of brickwork. At least some of the fields should be retained and maybe even developed into proper parkland for the residents to enjoy. Retail and businesses should be kept to essential service provision for the nearby residences - after all how many half empty business parks does one council need to have? Please look at your plans again and see if you can start to relocate some of the remaining businesses out of their tired old industrial estates (of which there are many) with more empty factories than are actually occupied and free up some brownfield space specifically for housing to be developed on one or more of them. I am sure if NTC offered incentives for businesses to move the borough would not have so many buildings going to wreck and ruin. There is nothing uglier than a whole load of empty factory buildings.</p> | | | <p>S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now DMS1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> | |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151306 | <p>S7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites This policy identifies the Council's preferred housing sites. The outstanding requirement for housing land supply for the plan period is identified in Table</p> | Site 4 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>8 as a gross target of 10,189 units. However the sites identified in Policy S7.3 only amount to a potential 8,806 units. There is clearly insufficient sites identified to meet the current OAN of the area and as such additional sites are required to ensure that the plan allocates sufficient suitable, available and achievable sites to promote and deliver development to meet the OAN. There are uncertainties with regard to some of the identified sites in S7.3 raising questions whether the sites will deliver the potential capacity identified, and specifically whether they will deliver the total number of units within the plan period. For example Site 3 Annitsford Farm in the North West area is identified as having the potential to deliver 400 new homes over the plan period. This site is constrained, parts of the site lie within Flood Zone 2 and 3 and significant buffer zones would be required to mitigate potential development impact on identified Local Wildlife Sites, the capacity of this site to deliver 400 units is over optimistic. Policy 7.3 includes two strategic sites 22-26 Killingworth Moor and 35-41 Murton which are detailed further in policy AS7.4. Again, there is uncertainty whether these two sites will deliver the anticipated potential housing numbers included in AS7.4 at 1,700 and 2,800 respectively given the known constraints, and</p> | | | <p>period to 2032, including the sites specifically highlighted in this representation. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (nowDM4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. Site 4 is included for assessment in the SHLAA (Site 333) and has been considered as a potential housing allocation through the Local Plan process. However, on consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retain as safeguarded land, potentially meeting the development needs of the borough post-2032.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that a range of additional work is being undertaken to provide further evidence of suitability for residential allocation. The Council encourages the landowner and agent to continue to engage positively through the consultation process.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>doubtful given the necessary lead in times for the required collaboration, master planning and infrastructure requirements whether these sites would deliver the proposed number of units within the plan period. Industry advice indicates average build out rates as between 30 to 45 per annum, even accepting a higher rate of 100 units per year as advocated by the SHLAA 2014 (5.33) these sites could take between 17 and 28 years to complete; given the lead in times and that the plan period commenced in 2011/12 it is unrealistic to expect that these sites will be completed and will deliver the full potential capacity within the plan period. To make up for this likely shortfall in provision within the plan period by the two strategic sites and uncertainty in respect of some of the preferred sites, the plan will need to make provision for additional residential development sites to meet the OAN within the plan period. This will need to consider the phased release of the Strategic Sites specifically in the early part of the plan period where development of these will not compromise or prejudice the overall development of the sites. There remains strong demand in North Tyneside for new housing. In order to deliver the OAN for the Borough, sites with capacity to deliver must be in places that are attractive to the</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>market, financially viable and in a range of locations which provide for a mix of housing and a range of tenures at a scale that the housing market can deliver. Our Client's has land in the North West area, the site is suitable, available and subject to highways improvements achievable for residential development. It can deliver sustainable development within the plan period. As previously safeguarded land the site has already been assessed as developable. The sites location would assist in minimising carbon emissions by locating new housing development in a location accessible to key services and facilities and within a convenient walking or cycling distance. Land within our Client's ownership has been promoted through the North Tyneside SHLAA, site 4 SHLAA reference 333 " Land west of Camperdown Industrial Estate. The SHLAA assessment indicates this site is not a preferred site but is identified as safeguarded land. A "Transport Assessment " Preliminary Transport Appraisal (WSP)(2014) has been prepared for the site this considers the potential for vehicular access and accessibility by non-car modes of transport. In brief the report notes: "ç The most favourable access to the site is from the southern site boundary from the A1056. The south of the site adjoins the single carriageway A1056</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>with a 40mph speed limit, which is fairly level for approximately 100m before rising towards the railway bridge. "ç Regard has been had to the impact of the Whitehouse Farm approved planning application to the south of the site and the proposed traffic mitigation measures. "ç An assessment of potential means of accessing the site including a new roundabout, a signalised junction and a ghost island junction have been considered. The Ghost Island junction would provide storage for right turning traffic minimising disruption to westbound traffic and delays to eastbound traffic. Widening within existing highway or within the development site and the relocation of existing services, the mitigation of land level differences would be required. "ç Provision of pedestrian footways to the north of the A1056 and crossing points at the A1056/A189 junction with links to the existing bridleway/waggon ways network through the site. "ç Further consideration is required for public transport including the provision or diversion of existing bus services. The site lies within Flood Zone 1, with no known or predicted flood risk arising from the site (1 in 1000 years). Comments from the EA regarding the management of surface water would form part of a detailed Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy for</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the site. It is noteworthy that Northumbria Water has indicated the site has "No conflicts'. Concerns have been raised by the NWT regarding the biodiversity value of the site and the relationship with nearby site statutory and non-statutory wildlife sites. A Preliminary Ecological Assessment is due to be undertaken to assess the site having regard to the cumulative impact of nearby developments. The site is actively farmed and is not set aside land or rough grazing, in this respect the potential biodiversity value of the site is likely to be low. A public right of way borders the site to the east and forms part of a wider network, however the majority of the site is in agricultural use and not accessible to the public. Assessments of the impact of nearby land uses including transport routes and the industrial estates will inform a noise assessment and potential mitigation measures. Site investigations will establish any potential historical contamination of the site however as the majority of the site has been actively farmed the risk is anticipated to be low. A desktop study indicates there are no Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments or other heritage assets on site, although acknowledgement is given to the importance of the historic waggon way to the east of the site. Taking into account the above factors is it</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | suggested that the site is in a suitable location, it is available and subject to mitigation measures for potential site constraints is an achievable site. It is recognised that these element require further assessment however evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the site is developable, our client is keen to work with the Local Planning Authority and would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further. Site 4 SHLAA 333 should be included within policy 7.3 as a preferred site. | | | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151346 | Policy S7:3. Distribution of Potential Housing Sites: CPRE welcomes the general predominance of brownfield sites but urges considerable caution about proposed developments in the Salters' Lane area because of the importance of wildlife corridors leading to the Gosforth Nature Reserve. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Comments note.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2(now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. A location which is adjacent to Gosforth Park Nature Reserve (SSSI) and sees partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be</p> | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. Further work is necessary, taking into account expert advice, to identify the scale and scope of development which would be appropriate. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. | |
| 899669 | | RESIDENT | LP20151399 | Site 128: I am just emailing you to let you know that I strongly support the designation of the Benton Curve as a wildlife corridor. | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 472456 | | RESIDENT | LP20151401 | Site 11 now Site E010: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example Site 11 now Site E010 contains a Site of Local Wildlife Interest, site 109 is located on a wildlife corridor and part of sites 35-41 is to provide ecological compensation for a development elsewhere in the borough. | Site 11 now Site E010 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 472456 | | RESIDENT | LP20151402 | Sites 35-41: Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and | Site 35 to | S 7.3 Distribution of | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | contrary to planning policy. For example Site 11 now Site E010 contains a Site of Local Wildlife Interest, site 109 is located on a wildlife corridor and part of sites 35-41 is to provide ecological compensation for a development elsewhere in the borough. | 41 | Potential Housing Development Sites | prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site. | solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899292 | | | LP20151405 | Site 45: I wish to object to the plan for housing to be built on site 45 (Hillheads). This is a very well used piece of land by many people in Hillheads estate. It is the only safe place for children to play since it is overlooked by many homes and the roads are relatively quiet. It has more the feel of a village green and should remain as an asset which encourages exercise, play and socialising within this community. There are also many residents in the surrounding streets who support my view. I appreciate the need to build more housing for our growing population but this site is not appropriate, furthermore local residents think so too. | Site 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. The suggestion of improvements to existing open space will be considered including, if necessary, through the Local Plan process. | No amendments proposed. |
| 797201 | | RESIDENT | LP20151408 | Site 35 - 41: My home directly borders one of the plots of land proposed for redevelopment- the area between West Monkseaton and Murton. As the | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>comments myself and hundreds of others made during the first round of so-called consultation were disregarded, I am at a loss as to how to better convey the enormity of a decision to build on what little green space is left in our borough. These fields are enjoyed by countless dog walkers, cyclists and riders every day, all year round. But you already know that. The area is a natural and unspoilt habitat for a range of wildlife, but you know that too. The streets around my home suffered flood damage in 2012 and despite the measures put in place recently, these fields are often waterlogged still. Schools in the area are oversubscribed already, GP and dental surgeries are stretched to the limit and the roads are congested. Your report recognises all of these as real concerns. I understand the need to build more houses across North Tyneside, but strongly object to the lion's share being built in one concentrated area. I would urge councillors to look again at the proposed sites and reduce considerably the number of homes planned for the areas separating Rake Lane, Monkseaton and Murton.</p> | | Development Sites | <p>coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity.</p> <p>The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful</p> | <p>of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. The importance of community services, including education and healthcare provision, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 808714 | | RESIDENT | LP20151411 | Site 35 - 41: I do not wish to see the areas around Killingworth and especially Murton Village developed | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151415 | As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | | | transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151421 | Site 35-41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151433 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151440 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151447 | Site 5: o These sites (and particularly site 5) form part of a wildlife corridor and are an important link allowing movement of wildlife between Killingworth and Gosforth. o Given the planned development adjacent to these sites and other proposed development nearby, these sites are of increasing importance to wildlife, playing an ever more vital role in allowing populations to move about freely, as well as providing forage, breeding opportunities and cover. o For these reasons, sites 5, 6 and 7 should be removed as development sites from the Local Plan. | Site 5 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. National planning policy requires LPAs to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife and the Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151448 | Site 6: o These sites (and particularly site 5) form part of a wildlife corridor and are an important link allowing movement of wildlife between Killingworth and Gosforth. o Given the planned development adjacent to these sites and other proposed development nearby, these sites are of | Site 6 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. National planning policy requires LPAs to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife and the Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Partial | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | increasing importance to wildlife, playing an ever more vital role in allowing populations to move about freely, as well as providing forage, breeding opportunities and cover. o For these reasons, sites 5, 6 and 7 should be removed as development sites from the Local Plan. | | | coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. | |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151449 | Site 7: o These sites (and particularly site 5) form part of a wildlife corridor and are an important link allowing movement of wildlife between Killingworth and Gosforth. o Given the planned development adjacent to these sites and other proposed development nearby, these sites are of increasing importance to wildlife, playing an ever more vital role in allowing populations to move about freely, as well as providing forage, breeding opportunities and cover. o For these reasons, sites 5, 6 and 7 should be removed as development sites from the Local Plan. | Site 7 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. National planning policy requires LPAs to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife and the Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151451 | Site 17: o This site forms part of a wildlife corridor and is an important link allowing movement of wildlife around the west of the borough and into Gosforth. The site also helps buffer the Rising Sun Country Park and provides important habitat for wintering waders (Golden Plover, a | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor and close proximity to Rising Sun CP does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | species cited as part of the Northumberland Coast SSSI assemblage) and farmland birds which would be lost by the development of this site. o Given the planned development adjacent to these sites and other proposed development nearby, these sites are of increasing importance to wildlife, playing an ever more vital role in allowing populations to move about freely, as well as providing forage, breeding opportunities and cover. o For these reasons site 17 should be removed as a development site from the Local Plan. | | | suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Following the grant of planning permission for the adjacent site at Station Road East (12/02025/FUL) land must be provided as ecological compensation to mitigate loss of habitat. Taking into account expert advice, work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan for the proposed strategic site at Murton in order to determine the most suitable location for this land. | |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151452 | Site 11 now Site E010: o This site is designated as a Site of Local Wildlife Interest (West Moor meadow) and also forms part of a key wildlife corridor providing an important link which allows the movement of wildlife between Killingworth and Gosforth. o Development on this site would destroy a Site of Local Wildlife Interest and would therefore be contrary to other policies in the Plan and the NPPF. In particular, there is a presumption that Local Plans will direct development to locations where there will not be an adverse impact on biodiversity when there are less damaging alternatives available (otherwise the Plan could not be | Site 11 now Site E010 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT031). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial designation as a SLCI and partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | considered sustainable). It is clear that there are other sites which would not involve destroying a site of conservation interest and therefore this site should be excluded from the Plan. Given the proximity of existing housing and the Balliol Business Park, development would curtail the existing wildlife corridor and fragment local wildlife populations. o There is already adequate employment land adjacent to Site 11 now Site E010 and therefore, further development in this vicinity is unnecessary as well as unwelcome. o For these reasons Site 11 now Site E010 should be removed as a development site from the Local Plan. | | | opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. The future employment and economic growth requirements of the borough mean that land is required for future employment development and it is considered that this site will play a key role in meeting that need over the plan period. | |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151455 | Site 22-26: sites 22 - 26 should be removed as development sites from the Local Plan. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151453 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | | Housing Development Sites | site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151460 | Site 35 - 41: sites 35 - 41 should be removed as development sites from the Local Plan, or at the very least, the proportion of this land allocated for development should be drastically reduced. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. | wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151459 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151470 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151475 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy | Site 35 to | S 7.3 Distribution of | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | 41 | Potential Housing Development Sites | prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151490 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | | | identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151492 | Site 66: Support the proposed allocation of brownfield land at North Shields Metro, Russell Street, North Shields (site 66) for housing. | Site 66 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2(now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151495 | Site 71: Support the proposed allocation of brownfield land at Metro Sidings at Waterville Road, North Shields (site 71) for housing. | Site 71 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2(now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151497 | Site 120: Support the proposed allocation of brownfield land adjacent to Benton Metro (site 120) for housing. | Site 120 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2(now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151500 | Site 14: Objection lodged that Land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA ref 298) should be allocated in whole or part for housing. As set out in the SHLAA, the site is 100% brownfield. According to NPPF para 17, a core planning principle is to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided it is not of high environmental value. Land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton is not of high environmental value and its reuse should therefore be encouraged. An objection is therefore lodged that land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA ref 298) should be allocated and developed in preference to the greenfield sites listed in S7.3. Greenfield sites are currently projected to contribute a significant number of dwellings to the supply including land at Annitsford Farm, 400 dwellings (policy ref 3), Killingworth Moor, 2000 dwellings (policy ref 22 " 26) and land at Murton, 3000 dwellings (policy ref 35 " 41). This approach of allocating and developing greenfield sites before brown is not consistent with national policy and is not sound. It is therefore | Site 14 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2(now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. Given that the majority of the site was until very recently used for railway sidings the brownfield context is acknowledged. This site has been assessed through the SHLAA (Site 298) and was included as a potential development site in the 2013 of the plan. However, following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. This is due to site constraints, principally the lack of suitable access to the site. As a result the site will not be selected as preferred residential allocation. Following designation as open space through the Local Plan, any proposal for alternative use of the site, including for residential development, would be assessed on individual merit in light of relevant policies. In this context, in addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | requested that Land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA ref 298) be allocated in whole or part for housing. Proposals Map Land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA ref 298) is shown on the Proposals Map as Green or Open Space. Nexus object to this proposed designation and ask that it be removed from the site leaving it uncoloured. | | | not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now DM4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement for new homes to 2032. As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. | |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151505 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151513 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 442914 | Big Tree Planning Ltd | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151518 | SHLAA Site: 305 The decision to pursue Growth Option B as stated at Paragraph 7.15 of the Plan is supported, as this is considered to be the most positive of the realistically achievable of the Growth Options. The previous consultation indicated that housing requirement could be reduced to between 10,500 and 12,000, which would have resulted in a strategy of restricted growth. Policy S7.3 states that the outstanding gross housing target for North Tyneside within this Plan's period is 10,189 dwellings. The potential housing development sites listed within this Policy have a combined indicated capacity of 8,806 dwellings, which leaves a shortfall to the outstanding gross housing target of 1,383 dwellings. Approximately 3,000 dwellings within the indicated capacity are proposed to be located on a Strategic Allocation site at Murton. However, the Murton site is well known, having been considered by various developers for many years but never brought forward due to insurmountable ground condition issues. It is therefore not considered that this strategic allocation can be | Site 305 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032, including the sites specifically highlighted in this representation. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now DM4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 305). A Review has been undertaken to support the Local Plan, this concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>delivered. The indicated capacity of all remaining sites identified within Policy S7.3 therefore totals approximately 5,806 dwellings; a shortfall to the Plan's outstanding gross housing target of approximately 4,383 dwellings. The Plan indicates at Paragraph 7.42 that some windfall development could help to meet any shortfall but the amount is not quantified, although the graph of North Tyneside's housing trajectory located at Paragraph 7.36 of the Plan shows approximately 1,500 dwellings across the plan period through windfall delivery. Whilst this figure is somewhat arbitrary, it is broadly appropriate given the level of previous years' completions on windfall sites as shown within the SHLAA. The same graph indicates that even with housing numbers on the undevelopable Murton Strategic Allocation being included, the Plan's yearly housing completion target will not be met until at least 2023/24. In summary, the Plan in its current form does not allocate sufficient deliverable sites to meet the Plan's target of 16,632 new dwellings between 2011 and 2032. As such, additional sites need to be identified and allocated through the Plan in order for it to be considered sound and to meet objectively assessed needs. Practically all land within the existing urban area is proposed within the Plan to be developed with the exception of</p> | | | <p>require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the retention of much-needed areas of open space; the loss of which would have a significant detrimental impact on the quality of life of residents throughout the Borough. As practically all developable land outside the existing urban area is designated as Green Belt it is evident that some Green Belt releases are unavoidable if the Council are to meet the objectively assessed housing need. Whilst the NPPF stresses the great importance of Green Belts as a means of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, the overarching presumption in favour of sustainable development requires local plans to meet objectively assessed needs. The NPPF allows for Green Belt boundaries to be altered "in exceptional circumstances" as part of the preparation or review of a local plan, with the focus on promoting sustainable patterns of development. It requires consideration of the consequences of channelling development towards non-Green Belt locations, and also allows land to be excluded from the Green Belt which is unnecessary to be kept permanently open. As discussed above, there is not sufficient land available outside of the Green Belt in North Tyneside to meet the Council's objectively assessed housing need. If existing Green Belt boundaries are to remain unaltered</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the only option is for the adjoining authorities of Northumberland County Council and Newcastle City Council to accommodate the undersupply. However, Newcastle City Council has just adopted its new local plan, and Northumberland County Council is at a similar stage to North Tyneside. What's more, both adjoining authorities are relying on significant Green Belt releases in order to accommodate their own objectively assessed housing need. As such, the displacement of North Tyneside's housing requirement to its neighbouring authorities is no more preferable in terms of Green Belt policy. In addition, it is not considered that channelling development to locations outside of North Tyneside would represent a significantly more sustainable option. The Government has made abundantly clear, both in the NPPF and in Ministerial statements; the urgent need to boost significantly the supply of housing and, as far as is consistent with other policies, to meet fully the needs of the relevant housing market area. Set against this is the great importance attached to preserving North Tyneside's Green Belt. Inspectors appointed to examine other local plans, such as the Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy Local Plan and the County Durham Plan, have indicated that the exceptional</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>circumstances required to justify Green Belt releases through the plan-making process only exist if there is an overriding need for development to achieve the strategic objectives and policies of the plan, and either (i) all possible options for development outside the Green Belt have been exhausted, or (ii) the development would represent a significantly more sustainable option than development on non- Green Belt land. In addition, Inspectors have indicated that there should be either no conflict with the purposes and integrity of the Green Belt or, at worst, limited conflict. As explained above, the overriding need for housing is required to achieve the strategic objectives of the Plan and all possible options for development outside the Green Belt have been exhausted. As such, some strategic Green Belt releases will be required in order for the Council to meet their strategic objectives. Potential Green Belt release sites should be considered individually to determine whether there would be any conflict with the purposes and integrity of the Green Belt. The development of the Site east of Kirklands, Burradon would not lead to the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas or neighbouring towns merging into one another; and it would not result in significant encroachment into the countryside. It would have no</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>impact on any historic town, and as mentioned above there is not sufficient derelict and other urban land available within the Borough. As such, if it were developed, there would be no conflict with the purposes and integrity of the Green Belt. The Site could accommodate approximately 500 dwellings, and it would be proposed to maintain a large area of open space towards the centre of the Site, where there is an existing pond. A view of the proposed alteration to the Policies Map is attached to this letter, which shows the Site as a Preferred Housing Development Site as well as the creation of a large triangular area of green or open space at the Site's centre. There is a legal agreement in place between North Tyneside Council and Mrs Jean Burke which stipulates that the Council's land would be developed and used to provide access thus generating a very significant capital receipt for the Council A full Transport Assessment carried out by Fairhurst has shown that a suitable access can be achieved from the existing roundabout to the south of the Site without the need for any other 3rd party land.</p> | | | | |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151520 | <p>Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | | Sites | As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 898767 | | | LP20151543 | Site 17: Our specific and strongly felt objections to the local plan are the loss of, or significant compromising of, wild life corridors especially site 17 adjacent to the regrettable development already compromising the wildlife corridor to the east of A186 (Station Rd), and site 139. Benton, like Killingworth and Murton, requires a strategic settlement buffer to protect | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | its identity and the significant conservation areas within it. This should be co-terminous with a significant wild life corridor through areas 139, 111 and 17. | | | impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | |
| 898767 | | | LP20151544 | Site 139: Our specific and strongly felt objections to the local plan are the loss of, or significant compromising of, wild life corridors especially site 17 adjacent to the regrettable development already compromising the wildlife corridor to the east of A186 (Station Rd), and site 139. Benton, like Killingworth and Murton, requires a strategic settlement buffer to protect its identity and the significant conservation areas within it. This should be co-terminous with a significant wild life corridor through areas 139, 111 and 17. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898767 | | | LP20151546 | Site 11 now Site E0101: Our specific and strongly felt objections to the local plan are: Benton, like Killingworth and Murton, requires a strategic settlement buffer to protect its identity and the significant conservation areas within it. This should be co-terminous with a significant wild life corridor through areas 139, 111 and 17. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 898767 | | | LP20151547 | We note that at least 1 approved housing development "" for 9 houses on Front Street on the Black Bull site is not marked in the plan. Perhaps there | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | For the sake of clarity, only outstanding planning permissions of 10 dwellings and above are shown on the map of suggested sites to accompany the consultation | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | are other small pockets that have not been revealed? | | Development Sites | exercise, as smaller sites would not be identifiable at this scale. However, it is very important to note that, all sites with planning permission, and every dwelling these correspond to, are included in the figures which determine the amount of land which needs to be allocated for development. Table 8, Row C) identifies a total of 4,810 units with planning permission (or minded to grant) at 31 December 2014, a total which includes every site with planning consent, including those of less than 10 units. From this a residual total for allocation is calculated. Therefore no potential delivery from outstanding planning permissions has been missed or ignored. | reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 424278 | SITA Up | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151549 | There are a number of points within the waste management section of chapter 10 of the Local Plan on which we would like to provide comment as detailed below, but SITA UK also own a site on the Benton Square Industrial Estate designated for waste uses which has remained vacant for two years now. In light of encroaching housing developments and allocations, together with the inability to make this site work as a viable waste/recycling facility, SITA UK have also provided comments here on policy S7.3 and propose the reallocation of the site for mixed use/housing. Section 7 "" Housing Policy S7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites Preferred site number 136, Unit 1&2 | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is included for assessment in the SHLAA (part of Site 497a). However, it is considered that the site is currently unsuitable for housing development, reflecting locational factors and site constraints, therefore it has not been considered as a potential housing allocation through the Local Plan process. On consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retain as employment land (NT010), meeting the economic growth and development needs of the borough over the plan period. Additionally, it is considered that despite the existing facility being vacant, this site is covered by Policy DM10.12 (now DM7.8) | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Wesley Way, Killingworth, is identified in Policy S7.3 for potentially 65 homes, yet this site is directly adjacent to a site designated for waste use; SITA UK's Benton Square waste recycling site on Wesley Way. This is in direct conflict with policy DM10.12 which seeks to protect land around established waste facilities as identified on the Policies Map. SITA UK's Benton Square site is currently on the market and has been vacant for two years after a number of different attempts (both by landowners SITA UK and by their tenants) to set up a viable recycling business on the site have failed. The 0.9 hectare waste site is significantly constrained by overhead power lines crossing the eastern half of the site and by the relatively recent "'Forest Gate' housing development overlooking the western half of the site from the north side of the Metro line. SITA UK strongly support policy DM10.12 but propose that the waste allocation for the Benton Square site be removed in favour of a designation for mixed use to match the designation of adjacent Units 1&2. Such a designation would fit more comfortably with the increasingly residential surroundings than the current waste use designation. The western half of the waste site could contribute an estimated 20-30 homes on brownfield land to the housing land provision, neatly completing a block of</p> | | | <p>which aims to protect such facilities unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer evidence of need.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>housing land rather than causing conflict in the Plan with a continuing waste designation. Public transport links are good, with Palmersville Metro station close by, and designation of SITA UK's currently vacant site could improve the viability of the mixed use designation for neighbouring Units 1&2. It is noted that Units 1&2 is identified as deliverable for housing in the 6-10 year window, whereas SITA UK's adjacent site is currently vacant and could reasonably be developed within 5 years. There are three points of access from SITA UK's site onto Wesley Way, although the central one has been blocked off with fencing due to layout of previous operations on site. These access points could be used to provide a residential street through the site, with housing at the western end and a buffer of green space or business use at the eastern end where the overhead lines cross the site. A Sustainability Appraisal has been prepared for SITA UK's Benton Square site based upon the methodology used by the Council and the assessment for the adjacent units; a copy is attached together with a site location plan. A formal pre-application request is also being submitted to establish the Planning Authority's view on the proposed use of the site for housing/mixed use. SITA UK consider that the re-designation of the currently</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | disused waste site at Benton Square for mixed use would be appropriate and that it could provide a sustainable, deliverable and viable development site for housing. | | | | |
| 899953 | | RESIDENT | LP20151552 | New Site: Whitley Bay along the coast has a number of derelict buildings and former hotels and pubs that are either boarded up or in the process of being demolished. I think these areas should be redeveloped to meet the need for housing stock. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. A number of derelict/vacant sites along the coast have been identified for allocation, e.g. Sites 48, 50 and 51, or have already been granted permission for redevelopment and so are included in the forecast delivery against the overall requirement. In addition, an allowance for small-sites and windfall development is made through the Local Plan, based on past trends and evidenced through the SHLAA, which provides a small proportion of the total housing requirement to 2032. These allowances include forecast of potential supply from conversion of existing premises such as hotels and pubs. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 899953 | | RESIDENT | LP20151553 | New site: Chirton has areas of brownfield sites that have development potential some of which have been noted as development sites but others have been missed off. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2(now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. As an example, Sites 77 and 78 incorporate a significant area of brownfield land in the Chirton area and are identified for mixed-use redevelopment. The Council welcome submission of any further sites, not yet considered, for inclusion in the next review of the SHLAA. | deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 899953 | | RESIDENT | LP20151554 | New site: The area below site 15 is also vacant. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The area to the east of Coach Lane (south of Site 15) is designated open space, much of which is occupied by existing sports pitches and associated facilities. At the current time, this area is not available for housing development and is well-used for recreation and leisure. Therefore, being unsuitable, it has not been considered as a potential allocation through the Local Plan. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151557 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151567 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 473231 | | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151589 | <p>Policy S7.3 states that the outstanding gross housing target for North Tyneside within this Plan's period is 10,189 dwellings. The potential housing development sites listed within this Policy have a combined indicated capacity of 8,806 dwellings, which leaves a shortfall to the outstanding gross housing target of 1,383 dwellings. Approximately 3,000 dwellings within the indicated capacity are proposed to be located on a Strategic Allocation site at Murton. However, the Murton site is well known, having been considered by various developers for many years but never brought forward due to insurmountable ground condition issues. It is therefore not considered that this strategic allocation can be delivered. The indicated capacity of all remaining sites identified within Policy S7.3 therefore totals approximately 5,806 dwellings; a shortfall to the Plan's outstanding gross housing target of approximately 4,383 dwellings. The Plan indicates at Paragraph 7.42 that some windfall development could help</p> | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032, including the sites specifically highlighted in this representation. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now DM4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. This land is included in the SHLAA (Site 306) but has been assessed as unsuitable for residential development and therefore undevelopable. This conclusion is due to the</p> | Amendment to be made to Policy AS1.9 to reflect Local Green Space designation for Killingworth Open Break. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>to meet any shortfall but the amount is not quantified, although the graph of North Tyneside's housing trajectory located at Paragraph 7.36 of the Plan shows approximately 1,500 dwellings across the plan period through windfall delivery. Whilst this figure is somewhat arbitrary, it is broadly appropriate given the level of previous years' completions on windfall sites as shown within the SHLAA. The same graph indicates that even with housing numbers on the undevelopable Murton Strategic Allocation being included, the Plan's yearly housing completion target will not be met until at least 2023/24. In summary, the Plan in its current form does not allocate sufficient deliverable sites to meet the Plan's target of 16,632 new dwellings between 2011 and 2032. As such, additional sites need to be identified and allocated through the Plan in order for it to be considered sound and to meet objectively assessed needs. It is proposed that the Site east of B1317 Killingworth Road, Killingworth Village be allocated to assist in the identified shortfall of allocated deliverable sites. At present, the Site forms part of the Killingworth Open Break, but a local plan review is considered an appropriate time to amend the boundaries of such local designations. Recently, planning permission (ref: 14/00730/FUL) on land to the east of</p> | | | <p>site being within Killingworth Open Break, with it considered that development would harm the fundamental character of Killingworth Village Conservation Area. This is set out in current adopted UDP policy and now incorporated into revised Policy S3.5 (now S1.9 Local Green Space) in the Local Plan. Therefore, this site has not been considered for residential allocation. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer, the exact location for which is yet to finalised, to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>the Site was granted for the provision of 125 dwellings. This site is shown on the 2015 Policies Map as a Large Site with Planning Permission, with an Indicative Strategic Settlement Buffer directly to the south. If a straight line is drawn between the southern boundary of that site with planning permission and the extent of existing residential development of Killingworth Village to the west of the Site, a logical extension is formed and this is the extent of the Site proposed for allocation within the Plan. This would allow land to the south to remain as open break, and it is suggested that the Indicative Strategic Settlement Buffer be extended west to Killingworth Road. A view of the proposed alteration to the Policies Map is attached to this letter, which shows the Site as a Preferred Housing Development Site; the Indicative Strategic Settlement Buffer extended to Killingworth Road; and the Killingworth Open Break realigned to facilitate this.</p> | | | | |
| 900011 | | RESIDENT | LP20151592 | <p>Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | problem. | | | walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| | | | LP20151596 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|--------------------------|
| | | | | | | | considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | detailed masterplanning. |
| 900084 | | | LP20151615 | Site 45 - Objection I am e-mailing to oppose any housing that is going to be built on the piece of land number 45. This is a tiny area next to an old peoples home where children play football and people walk their dogs. I thought the government was concerned about obesity in children! I will be interested to hear where you propose these children play without having to cross main roads. The information on your consultation is unclear and I am sure people think you are proposing the site of Bromley Field. When I have asked nearby residents nobody seems to know anything about it. I'm sure your answer will be they should read the consultation . I personally don't think anyone would believe you would build on such an | Site 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | important green area for the community. You list public events but I feel with so little information attendance will be low. I really hope you will reconsider as there are many other proposed sights 35-41 that are much more suitable for housing. | | | | |
| 900084 | | | LP20151616 | Site 35-41 - Support I am e-mailing to oppose any housing that is going to be built on the piece of land number 45. This is a tiny area next to an old peoples home where children play football and people walk their dogs. I thought the government was concerned about obesity in children! I will be interested to hear where you propose these children play without having to cross main roads. The information on your consultation is unclear and I am sure people think you are proposing the site of Bromley Field. When I have asked nearby residents nobody seems to know anything about it. I'm sure your answer will be they should read the consultation . I personally don't think anyone would believe you would build on such an important green area for the community. You list public events but I feel with so little information attendance will be low. I really hope you will reconsider as there are many other proposed sights 35-41 that are much more suitable for housing. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development at Murton noted (rather than 45). | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151618 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a | Site 35 to | S 7.3 Distribution of | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | 41 | Potential Housing Development Sites | prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151622 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | | | identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151623 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. "ç | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and further improve Holystone Interchange, as well as working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | for new services and public transport links. | |
| 900101 | | RESIDENT | LP20151631 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 900101 | | RESIDENT | LP20151634 | My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | | Housing Development Sites | site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 900103 | | RESIDENT | LP20151638 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | | | delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 900103 | | RESIDENT | LP20151642 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links.</p> | <p>exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |
| 899194 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | | LP20151647 | <p>Site 42: Policy S7.3 outlines the distribution of potential housing development sites, totalling some 8,806 homes dispersed across a multitude of proposed allocations. However, after the removal of planning permissions and completions, this is 1,383 dwellings short of the proposed housing requirement. It would appear that the shortfall is intended to be addressed through windfall developments. NWL recommends that the Council consider increasing the overall amount of allocations provided by the plan and increasing the potential yield of the currently proposed allocations not only to account for this potential shortfall but</p> | Site 42 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Support for development noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2(now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation (part brownfield). The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5. Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the</p> | <p>No amendments proposed.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>also to provide flexibility within the plan. NWL's site at Moorhouses Reservoir, Billy Mill, North Shields (ref 42) is identified as a brownfield site with potential to accommodate 50 homes. NWL strongly support the identification of this site for residential development and request that it is taken forward as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. NWL support the allocation of the whole site for residential development on the Proposals Map however NWL consider that based on a density of 30 dwellings per hectare, the site could accommodate around 96 dwellings, almost double the suggested potential yield of the site within the policy. NWL would therefore request that the yield of the site is increased to 96 dwellings to ensure the policy more accurately reflects the site's potential and can assist in meeting the housing shortfall.</p> <p>, As outlined above, Moorhouses Reservoir is located on partially brownfield land, in close proximity to a range of local services. Whilst the remainder of the site is currently Open Space, we note that the Open Space designation (policy R2 of the North Tyneside UDP) has not been carried forward in the Local Plan and instead the whole site is now proposed to be allocated in the Proposals Map and Policy S7.3 for housing. NWL support this approach and consider that,</p> | | | <p>overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The role that redevelopment could play in improving image and addressing issues of anti-social behaviour is acknowledged.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | notwithstanding the allocation, any loss of Open Space would be acceptable on the following grounds: New areas of high quality open space and green infrastructure can be incorporated into a residential development on the site; There are a number of other areas of open space in the surrounding area, which the local community can access; The development of the site would address and prevent anti-social behaviour taking place on the site to the benefit of the local community; and The site could make an important and positive contribution towards North Tyneside Council achieving a deliverable and sustainable housing land supply. | | | | |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151660 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151666 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 898777 | | | LP20151676 | <p>Policy S7.2 identifies a housing requirement of 16,632 net additional dwellings over the Plan Period or 792 dwellings per annum. Whilst this represents an uplift from the now revoked RSS requirement, which is welcomed, it actually represents a decrease upon the previous consultation which identified a requirement of 16,272 dwellings between 2013 and 2030 or 957 per annum. It is considered that, in order to ensure conformity with the NPPF in terms of seeking to boost significantly the supply of housing, this requirement should be expressed as a minimum. Notwithstanding the above, it is also the view that the overall housing requirement is set too low within the Consultation Local Plan. Following the publication of the 2014 SHMA the 2012 based Sub-National Household Projections (SNHP) were released. The NPPG advised that these represent the most up to date estimate of future household growth and, therefore, should be used as a starting point for determining growth itself. However,</p> | Site 102 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032, including the sites specifically highlighted in this representation. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5. Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region.</p> <p>Site 102 is included for assessment in the SHLAA (Site 059) and has been considered as a potential housing allocation through the Local Plan process. However, on</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>whilst the 2012 based SNHP are a starting point it needs to be acknowledged that these have been influenced by a period of recession and lower household growth as a result. In light of this it could be the case that the current household projections suppress the actual future rate of household growth. The 2012 SNHP should, therefore, be considered as an absolute minimum starting point with an uplift, in particular, required to meet the economic aspirations highlighted in Section 5 of the Local Plan. In this regard, paragraph 5.22 of the plan identifies, through the application of Employment Growth Scenario "Medium", the creation of at least 707 additional jobs per annum. Despite this, the proposed housing requirement only provides for 654 jobs per annum. This equates to 53 jobs per annum, or 1,113 over the period of the housing requirement. It is, therefore, recommended that the Council address this anomaly by providing an appropriate uplift in the housing requirement. It is also considered that the housing land requirement should also account for the potential non-delivery or under-delivery of existing permission/commitments. Policy S7.3 details proposed allocations to provide sufficient capacity for 8,806 dwellings. This is 1,383 dwellings short of the proposed housing requirement, once</p> | | | <p>consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retain as employment land, meeting the economic growth and development needs of the borough over the plan period. It is acknowledged that a range of additional work is being undertaken to provide further evidence of suitability for residential allocation. The Council encourages the landowner and agent to continue to engage positively through the consultation process.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>planning permissions and completions are removed. It would seem that the shortfall is intended to be made good through windfall developments. However, even if the rate of windfalls indicated within the 2014/15 SHLAA were to continue to come forward this would only provide capacity for 810 dwellings, still 573 units short of the housing requirement. In order to address this deficiency a further quantum of housing should be allocated to provide flexibility required within the Plan for both non-delivery and under-delivery of sites. In addition, the North Tyneside Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2014) also considered the Swales Industrial Estate as a potential housing site. This considered that the site was suitable and viable, but not presently available due to multiple ownerships across the site. Policy S5.2 of the Local Plan Consultation , therefore, seeks to retain the Swales Industrial Estate for employment use. . Conclusion In light of the above, and for the following principal reasons, it is considered that Swales Industrial Estate should be allocated for housing within the emerging North Tyneside Local Plan:</p> <p>>The ELR has confirmed that there is more than sufficient identified employment land to meet forecast demands; >The ELR identifies a negative requirement for industrial</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>land over the Plan period with a significant increased demand for B1 office space and, to a lesser extent a B8 accommodation, with high quality accommodation in good geographical locations sought. As an industrial estate it accommodates over 2/3 industrial uses with circa 25% B8 use. The reuse of the site for residential development would clearly provide a more appropriate use for the site, in planning terms, given, first, the reducing demand for industrial land and, secondly, geographically the site is not the best location for B8 uses;</p> <p>>The loss of 2.5ha of employment land in this location will not compromise the Council's ability to meet their economic aspirations, through the implementation of the strategy set out at Policy S5.2 of the Consultation Local Plan; >The Site Survey Data Base (February 2015) confirms the site's potential for housing; >It is considered that the housing requirement identified by local plan Policy S7.3 is too low. Allocating Swales Industrial Estate for residential development will assist in addressing this identified housing shortfall; >The nature of the area in the vicinity of the site, aside from the gas storage facility which is due to be decommissioned, is very much residential in nature. As such, residential use of the site would be more compatible in the context of the</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>surrounding area, than its continued use for industry/storage and distribution; >The site is in a highly sustainable location, very well served by public transport in the form of Howdon metro station and frequent bus services passing the site along Howdon Lane. In addition, there is a good level of services and facilities in close proximity to the site, including a school and children's nursery, a sports recreational facility at Howdon Park and retail facilities a short distance north along Howdon Lane; > Residential development on the site would represent the efficient re-use of brownfield land within the urban area; > Site with SHLAA reference 037, known as Howdon Tip and adjoining the industrial estate to the east, has been identified in the SHLAA (2014) as a potential housing site. However, development on this site is dependent on access through the industrial estate. As such, while Swales Industrial Estate is capable of a stand-alone residential development, its development could also unlock the residential potential of the site next door; > In terms of the provisions of paragraph 47 of the NPPF, it is considered that the site is deliverable, with the issue of multiple ownership resolved through confirmation that all respective land owners are willing and keen to promote the site for residential</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | development. In light of the above it is respectfully requested that the North Tyneside Local Plan is amended through the following: . 1. Deletion of employment allocation NT033 (Swales Industrial Estate) from Local Plan Policy S5.2; and 2. The inclusion of Swales Industrial Estate as a housing allocation, for a quantum to be agreed, within Local Plan Policy S7.3. | | | | |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151678 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151684 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links.</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| 899297 | | | LP20151707 | <p>Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek clarification on why some sites with current planning permission have not been highlighted in the Policies Map. Many of these sites were not allocated through the previous UDP and would be likely to contribute significantly towards the land allocation for new housing developments. Not including these on the map can mislead the reader into thinking these sites are not going to be developed. I note the alteration to the map in this respect, however it is not clear from the map if these areas (now with planning permission) contribute towards the overall housing number aims? . I have serious concerns over the allocation of land for new housing on land that has already been targeted for off-site mitigation for existing developments such as Station Road mitigation land at Murton. I also note that local councillors have also included this land in claims about flood relief, which I understood to be separate from any planning obligations at Station Road. Mitigation and compensatory land for biodiversity should not be developed. This will not contribute towards biodiversity net gain, nor does it plan positively for the "protection... of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure" (paragraph 114 of NNPF). It is therefore vital that the LPA includes a</p> | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>For the sake of clarity, only outstanding planning permissions of 10 dwellings and above are shown on the map of suggested sites to accompany the consultation exercise, as smaller sites would not be identifiable at this scale. However, it is very important to note that, all sites with planning permission, and every dwelling these correspond to, are included in the figures which determine the amount of land which needs to be allocated for development. Table 8, Row C) identifies a total of 4,810 units with planning permission (or minded to grant) at 31 December 2014, a total which includes every site with planning consent, including those of less than 10 units. From this a residual total for allocation is calculated. Therefore no potential delivery from outstanding planning permissions has been missed or ignored.</p> <p>Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a</p> | <p>The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>policy that states that land used for mitigation for losses and adverse impacts on biodiversity should remain un-developed in perpetuity. . Furthermore, I do not consider the wildlife corridor allocations to be either functional or accurate to what is on the ground. These appear to be very loose links between small areas of green land (a lot of which is either currently allocated for development or is allocated in this new Local Plan) that do not form any coherent tangible wildlife link across the borough. For these wildlife corridors to have any functionality or be defensible in a planning inquiry they should be realistic and enforceable. Therefore at present the wildlife corridors do not meet NPPF requirement (paragraph 109) to establish "coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures" . . The LPA should plan positively for biodiversity and produce a targeted, strategic plan for areas that would be suitable for off-site mitigation. This plan should produce a series of linked areas that would be suitable and produce a net gain for biodiversity across the borough to meet the requirements of NPPF. Again we make reference to paragraph 114 of NPPF that requires LPAs to "set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation,</p> | | | <p>coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | <p>protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure" . The mapping of areas for habitat creation and retention (by a local partnership) is required by NPPF paragraph 117. This has not happened. . The North Tyneside Sustainable Sewage Study is looking at the sewage capacity across the borough in light of Howden Treatment Works being at capacity. I have concerns that some of these allocations may not be sustainable in-light of this. Neither is it apparent that any current or potential flood attenuation measures have been adequately considered or identified in the plan. . Furthermore, I note that other consultee responses do not consider the allocations below appropriate for development for the reasons outline for each site below, and I am in full agreement with the comments:</p> | | | | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151708 | <p>Site 3: Objection This site is adjacent to the Annitsford Pond LWS and as such development in this area is likely to isolate the site (thus not meeting the requirements of either paragraph 110 to minimise€; adverse effects on the local and natural environment or paragraph 114 plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity. The Seaton Burn runs through this site. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust, in</p> | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | conjunction with the LPA, have been doing works along this burn to restore it (as it is failing Water Framework Directive requirements) and to help mitigate flood risks along the burn catchment. Allocating development in this site would not only jeopardise the works already carried out but could also add to flood risk and the adverse impacts that are causing the burn to fail against WFD. | | | through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Proposals for development will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and ongoing improvement works to the Seaton Burn. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151709 | Site 4: Objection This site along with the allocation of site 109 will effectively cause the isolation of Gosforth Park SSSI and Local Wildlife Sites. Not only could this adversely impact upon a statutorily protected site (contrary to paragraph 118 of NPPF) but this would also have significant adverse effects upon the Wildlife Corridor, as such not meeting the requirements of paragraph 114 of NPPF to plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity. This site has approved planning permission on it. | Site 4 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Site 4 is included for assessment in the SHLAA (Site 333) and has been considered as a potential allocation for development through the Local Plan process. However, on consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retained as safeguarded land, potentially meeting the development needs of the borough post-2032. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|---|--|
| 899297 | | | LP20151710 | Site 5 Objection This site is situated within a wildlife corridor. Development in a wildlife corridor renders the objectives of a wildlife corridor untenable. | Site 5 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A policy has been added to the Local Plan to address development issues within identified Wildlife Corridors. |
| 899297 | | | LP20151711 | Site 9, now Site E008, Objection It is recognised that this site would be strategically placed for employment, we would have considerable concerns over any residential development in this area and its potential impacts (from increased footfall, pollution, run-off, changes to water levels and domestic pets etc.) due to its close proximity to Gosforth Park SSSI. Indeed I note a speculative submission has arisen due to this allocation. At present this land has ecological value from the scrub and rough grasslands that have established and that the site could have potential for ecologically sensitive flood mitigation should it be allocated | Site 9, now Site E008, | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT055). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. A location which is adjacent to Gosforth Park Nature Reserve (SSSI) does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. Further work is necessary, taking into account expert advice, to identify the scale and scope of | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | for development. I would, therefore, suggest that if the LPA were to produce a strategic biodiversity mitigation/compensation plan, that this site be included in it. | | | development which would be appropriate. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151712 | Site 11 now Site E010: Objection The development on land allocated as an SLCI would be contrary to paragraph 110 to minimise€; adverse effects on the local and natural environment or paragraph 114 plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity. I also note that this area is of semi-improved neutral grassland (potentially mitigation for an earlier residential development). This habitat is a Local BAP priority and to develop is would be contrary to policy S/8.4 in the Local Plan and to paragraph 117 of NPPF to "promote the preservation€; of priority habitats€; . | Site 11 now Site E010 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT031). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. A new policy is proposed designating an 'open break' which would cover the proposed safeguarded land to the south of West Moor and the northern section of Site 11 now Site E010 covering the SLCI. This proposal would reflect the significance of this open space to the character of West Moor and protection of biodiversity value. The Council biodiversity officer has recommended an adequate buffer for the SLCI. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 899297 | | | LP20151713 | Site 17: Objection This is not a suitable allocation as this area, alongside site 18 (now subject to approved planning | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | permission) provide important habitat and buffer to the Rising Sun Country Park, as well as wildlife links. The site also includes mature hedgerows that also provide wildlife links across the area. Again the wildlife corridor runs through this site. | | Housing Development Sites | suitability. Close proximity to the Rising Sun CP and partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151714 | Sites 22-26: Objection There are considerable concerns over the impacts of development on these sites on the water quality and flooding of the Briardene. Like the Seaton Burn this watercourse was considered failing by the Environment Agency and the Northumberland Wildlife Trust, in conjunction with the LPA, have been carrying out works to mitigate for flood risks and water quality. To develop here could result in increased flood risk and a decrease in water quality. IN addition, there appears to be areas of semi-improved grassland which may fall under the priority habitats of the Local BAP for neutral grasslands. Development of these would be contrary to paragraph 117 of NPPF to | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | "promote the preservation of or priority habitats. . . Additionally, wildlife corridors run through these sites. Without properly defined wildlife corridor boundaries ad hoc development will have significant impacts upon biodiversity and wildlife corridors, therefore not adhering to paragraph 114 of NPPF. | | | Proposals for development will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and ongoing improvement works to the Briardene. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151715 | Site 29 : Objection This site has been subject to a planning application and as the was refused, it is unclear why this is still included in the Local Plan. This site supports a Local Wildlife Site. To develop this site would be contrary to paragraph 110 of NPPF to "minimise" adverse effects on the local and natural environment, to paragraph 114 to "plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity and to paragraph 117 of NPPF to "promote the preservation of or priority habitats as this site supports neutral/basic semi-improved/unimproved grassland, a BAP habitat. It would also be in contradiction to the Local Plan policy S/8.4c to conserve and enhance Local Sites. | Site 29 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The application in question (12/00637/FUL) was refused in May 2015, after the LPCD 2015 was finalised and, indeed, after the close of the consultation exercise. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is apparent that there are still significant obstacles to delivery. However the scheme submitted at the time was deemed acceptable by North Tyneside's biodiversity officer. It is considered that a 65 units scheme, as part of a mixed-use allocation, is still possible for this wider site but deliverability in the short-term is questionable. The importance of the need | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151716 | <p>Site 34: Objection This site is partly Local Wildlife Site and mitigation for the developments at Cobalt Business Park. To develop the Local Wildlife site would be contrary to paragraph 110 of NPPF to "minimise" adverse effects on the local and natural environment , to paragraph 114 to "plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity" and to paragraph 117 of NPPF to "promote the preservation of priority habitats as this site supports neutral/basic semi-improved/unimproved grassland, a BAP habitat. It would also be in contradiction to the Local Plan policy S/8.4c to conserve and enhance Local Sites. I note that the area of land provides important grassland habitats that complements the largely wooded adjacent Country Park and also provide an important ecological buffer. I would suggest that there is little point in site mitigation if it is to be allocated for development further down the line. This ultimately does not mitigate for the permanent impacts of the previous development.</p> | Site 34 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (part NT030).</p> <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| 899297 | | | LP20151717 | <p>Sites 35-41 : Objection The Northumberland Wildlife Trust has identified a number of concerns over the allocation of these sites (35-41). Firstly, a large proportion of this area has been offered as is a compensation site for permanent ecological losses from another housing development. To develop it would therefore render the ecological compensation of this previous application untenable. This area should, therefore, not be included in the development allocations. Secondly, parts of this site are being considered by the North Tyneside, Northumbrian Water and the Environment Agency to mitigate for flood risks across the borough. Not only would development here mean this needed flood mitigation would not be carried out, but it would also add to flood risk and water quality reductions. Thirdly, it is very unclear why this area is has not been allocated as a Wildlife Corridor, as it is at present functioning as one, being some of the only open and connected green space in this area (unlike parts of the Wildlife Corridor to the east; note that NPPF states that Wildlife Corridors are "areas of habitat connecting wildlife populations" and therefore it would seem logical to allocate those areas where there is a green link as a Wildlife Corridor.). NPPF requires LPAs paragraph 117 to "identify and map components of the</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site.</p> <p>The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Wildlife corridor designation does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and</p> | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | local ecological networks, including wildlife corridors. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust feels that this has not been met. The wildlife corridor now runs through this site, however, as it is not excluded from development, there seems little point to it. | | | overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151718 | Site 75: Objection The Northumberland Wildlife Trust raised concerns that this is an area of woodland that has been allocated for development in an area where other more suitable sites for development are available. To develop here would be contrary to the LPAs own Local Plan policy DM/8.8 to support strategies and proposals that would protect and manage existing woodland. | Site 75 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Comments noted. Following the submission of this representation, Planning Officers held a meeting with a representative from NWT during May 2015. NWT have subsequently withdrawn the objection relating to this particular site in light of an acknowledgement that there is no evidence to support the ecological merit previously identified. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899297 | | | LP20151719 | Site 9, now Site E008, 9: Objection The Northumberland Wildlife Trust has raised concerns over the allocation of this site as it falls within a Wildlife Corridor and as such would be contrary to paragraph 114 of NPPF to "plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity". Furthermore, to develop this entire area would not support the aims of the LPAs own | Site 9, now Site E008, 9 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Wildlife corridor designation does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | policy AS/8.9 for encouraging "improvements to the area for wildlife and recreation€ . A significant boundary revision would be sort for this site. | | | policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151720 | Site 109 : Objection This site along with the allocation of site 4 will effectively cause the isolation of Gosforth Park SSSI and Local Wildlife Sites. Not only could this adversely impact upon a statutorily protected site (contrary to paragraph 118 of NPPF) but this would also have significant adverse effects upon the Wildlife Corridor, as such not meeting the requirements of paragraph 114 of NPPF to plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity. Furthermore, this site is within the Wildlife Corridor and development within this would be adverse to the aims of the designation. This site has also been noted by the Northumberland Wildlife Trust to have developed habitats suitable for ground nesting birds (including farmland birds; BAP priority species) and wading birds. The loss of this could impact upon the aims of the Local BAP. From local press coverage, the development of this site appears to be going ahead. Outline plans for the area "" Indigo Business Park, do not include the most eastern | Site 109 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is allocated as employment land through the current UDP and it is proposed that this designation is retained in the Local Plan (NT058). In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. A location which is adjacent to Gosforth Park Nature Reserve (SSSI) and an LWS and also see partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. At this stage, the Local Plan does not specifically outline the precise area of the site which would be subject to development, rather simply outlining the overall boundary of the allocation. As a result, careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. Further work is necessary, taking into account expert advice, to identify the scale and scope of development which would be appropriate. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | end despite assurances that that this area would remain open as a wildlife corridor to link Gosforth Park SSSI to Weetslade Country Park. This does not appear to be the case from the Local Plan, as the entire area is allocated. It is very difficult to see how the plans, in their current form, allow for any wildlife movement in and out of a nationally designated site and into the wider area, including Weetslade Country Park. Furthermore, as with many of the site allocations a wildlife corridor has been allocated across this area, but again there is no actual provision for this on the ground and such an allocation therefore appears untenable. | | | and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151721 | Site 139 : Objection This site is situated within a wildlife corridor. Development in a wildlife corridor renders the objectives of a wildlife corridor untenable. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151732 | S7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites 41. Whilst the HBF does not wish to comment upon the acceptability, or otherwise, of individual sites it is important that the sites are deliverable and there is in-built flexibility to provide for any under delivery from allocations. According to the table within policy S7.3 the overall proposed allocations provide sufficient capacity for 8,806 dwellings. This is 1,383 dwellings short of the proposed housing requirement, once planning permissions and completions are removed. In common with our response to Table 8 (see above) we consider that the gap is actually greater due to the likelihood that some existing permissions are likely never to be implemented. 42. It would appear that the shortfall is intended to be made good through windfall developments. Whilst the NPPF, paragraph 48, enables local authorities to make an allowance for such sources of delivery this must be based upon robust and credible evidence that such sites will continue to provide a reliable supply. The 2014/15 SHLAA identifies at paragraph 8.50 that 356 windfalls came forward during the 5 year period from 2009 to 2014 at a rate of 45 per annum. Even if this rate of windfalls were to continue to come forward | Windfall | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032, including the sites specifically highlighted in this representation. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now DM4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | over the remaining 18 years of the plan period this would only provide capacity for 810 dwellings, still 573 units short of the housing requirement. It is unclear how this gap is intended to be filled. 43. The HBF recommends that the Council consider increasing the overall amount of allocations provided by the plan not only to account for this potential shortfall but also to provide flexibility within the plan. | | | | |
| 396220 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20151741 | Sites 35 to 41 - Concerns Residents have contacted members of our Group to express their concerns about the proposals in the North Tyneside Local Plan: Consultation 2015. In particular 1. The areas shown for development should be spread more fairly across the Borough, rather than in large concentration, especially in the Murton area. | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in the strategic areas of Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst seeking an overall distribution of remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, in Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy and is followed by site-specific assessment, including consideration of the suitability and deliverability/developability of each site, to select the range of suggested allocations. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151744 | Site 71: Support housing on this site, removing a noisy use unsuitable next to residential areas. Access should be off both Hylton Street, the southern end of Henry Street, and potentially Waterville Terrace even if just pedestrian and cycle access down the bankside to Waterville primary school. (Years ago there was a scheme for road access to the Hylton Street Metro Maintenance Depot from Waterville Road.) Development of houses (not | Site 71 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. Nexus, as landowner, have confirmed that when this site is no longer needed for everyday operational requirements then this will be available for redevelopment. The timescales for this are likely to be short-term but do involve a process of finalising and securing an alternative location. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | flats on this part of the site at least) should front both Hylton and Henry Streets, being of no more than 2 storeys on the eastern half of the site, be 'in keeping' (not just "respect" because the term get twisted by architects) the traditional terrace housing adjacent (at least on the eastern end of the site), and provide sufficient onsite parking to cater for their own needs, within curtilages. The site could do with a short planning brief, with input/consultation of local residents. See also comments on design policies. | | | The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. Importantly this includes assessing the suitability of a range of potential options for site access and identifying the best means. The Local Plan includes a range of policies to deliver new development which is attractively designed, including Policy DM9.2 (now DM6.2). | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151750 | Site 64: Object to these being designated, promoted or anything else, for housing. These are sites which are suitable for main town centre uses, and are in such uses presently. Opportunities for new town centre uses/development, and for some of the retail predicted to be required in the plan period, are in short supply in North Shields. By contrast housing can fit in / go pretty much anywhere (conversions, new build etc). And Site 65 is only identified for 6 new homes, which is a waste of a site. These three sites are less close to nearby housing in practice than many others which adds to their suitability. The 'town centres first' approach in the plan is laudable, but to make it work there is a need for large-ish sites where town centre stuff can go. And as the Bingo Hall is a very | Site 64 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). Therefore, the Council is keen to promote the reuse of brownfield land in town centres and the Local Plan looks to focus development within the main urban area. However, the need to deliver new homes is not looked at in isolation and Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) aims to pursue growth and regeneration of town centres by delivering new development, but only when this is appropriate and not detrimental to existing circumstances. This decision is also taken on consideration of the retail policies of the Plan, which identify future demand for, and criteria for the location of, additional retail provision across the borough. Whilst the current proposal is for housing, consideration will be given as to whether a | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | bulky building, its replacement with another (for town centre uses) would be relatively acceptable. Without a hard copy plan to scale, it seems that Site 65 with 66 combined could accommodate the size of unit that para. 6.66 says is required. (And perhaps 64 depending on what current employment and leisure uses were to remain.) | | | mixed-use allocation would be more appropriate. In such a case, proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and retail uses. There could be an opportunity to consider a group of sites within North Shields town centre (potentially including Sites 60 to 66) a wider strategy for the area, reflecting a need for a regeneration programme in this area to help manage change. | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151751 | Site 65: Object to these being designated, promoted or anything else, for housing. These are sites which are suitable for main town centre uses, and are in such uses presently. Opportunities for new town centre uses/development, and for some of the retail predicted to be required in the plan period, are in short supply in North Shields. By contrast housing can fit in / go pretty much anywhere (conversions, new build etc). And Site 65 is only identified for 6 new homes, which is a waste of a site. These three sites are less close to nearby housing in practice than many others which adds to their suitability. The 'town centres first' approach in the plan is laudable, but to make it work there is a need for large-ish sites where town centre stuff can go. And as the Bingo Hall is a very bulky building, its replacement with another (for town centre uses) would be relatively acceptable. Without a | Site 65 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). Therefore, the Council is keen to promote the reuse of brownfield land in town centres and the Local Plan looks to focus development within the main urban area. However, the need to deliver new homes is not looked at in isolation and Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) aims to pursue growth and regeneration of town centres by delivering new development, but only when this is appropriate and not detrimental to existing circumstances. This decision is also taken on consideration of the retail policies of the Plan,, which identify future demand for, and criteria for the location of, additional retail provision across the borough. Whilst the current proposal is for housing, consideration will be given as to whether a mixed-use allocation would be more appropriate. In such a case, proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | hard copy plan to scale, it seems that Site 65 with 66 combined could accommodate the size of unit that para. 6.66 says is required. (And perhaps 64 depending on what current employment and leisure uses were to remain.) Sites 65 and 66 need to be joined together to get around the problems of access identified with Site 66 in the Sites Schedule in the way those comments in the schedule hint at. It would allow a town centre use together with its own car parking (accessed from Russell Street). The taxi rank issue is not insurmountable, perhaps as part of this car park, and the one way system on 3 streets could be altered. For 65 and 66 there needs to be a policy saying they need comprehensive treatment, and in the final plan they should be numbered the same with one line around them both: i.e. be one site. | | | but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and retail uses. There could be an opportunity to consider a group of sites within North Shields town centre (potentially including Sites 60 to 66) a wider strategy for the area, reflecting a need for a regeneration programme in this area to help manage change. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. Crucial in this instance will be resolution of issues relating to access and parking. | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151752 | Site 66: Object to these being designated, promoted or anything else, for housing. These are sites which are suitable for main town centre uses, and are in such uses presently. Opportunities for new town centre uses/development, and for some of the retail predicted to be required in the plan period, are in short supply in North Shields. By contrast housing can fit in / go pretty much anywhere (conversions, new build etc). And Site 65 is only identified for 6 new homes, | Site 66 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). Therefore, the Council is keen to promote the reuse of brownfield land in town centres and the Local Plan looks to focus development within the main urban area. However, the need to deliver new homes is not looked at in isolation and Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) aims to pursue growth and regeneration of town centres by delivering new development, but only when this is appropriate and not detrimental to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>which is a waste of a site. These three sites are less close to nearby housing in practice than many others which adds to their suitability. The 'town centres first' approach in the plan is laudable, but to make it work there is a need for large-ish sites where town centre stuff can go. And as the Bingo Hall is a very bulky building, its replacement with another (for town centre uses) would be relatively acceptable. Without a hard copy plan to scale, it seems that Site 65 with 66 combined could accommodate the size of unit that para. 6.66 says is required. (And perhaps 64 depending on what current employment and leisure uses were to remain.) Sites 65 and 66 need to be joined together to get around the problems of access identified with Site 66 in the Sites Schedule in the way those comments in the schedule hint at. It would allow a town centre use together with its own car parking (accessed from Russell Street). The taxi rank issue is not insurmountable, perhaps as part of this car park, and the one way system on 3 streets could be altered. For 65 and 66 there needs to be a policy saying they need comprehensive treatment, and in the final plan they should be numbered the same with one line around them both: i.e. be one site.</p> | | | <p>existing circumstances. This decision is also taken on consideration of the retail policies of the Plan,, which identify future demand for, and criteria for the location of, additional retail provision across the borough.</p> <p>Whilst the current proposal is for housing, consideration will be given as to whether a mixed-use allocation would be more appropriate. In such a case, proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and retail uses.</p> <p>There could be an opportunity to consider a group of sites within North Shields town centre (potentially including Sites 60 to 66) a wider strategy for the area, reflecting a need for a regeneration programme in this area to help manage change.</p> <p>The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. Crucial in this instance will be resolution of issues relating to access and parking.</p> | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151753 | Site 61: Object to these being designated, promoted or anything else, | Site 61 | S 7.3 Distribution of | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>for housing. Again these are sites more suitable than many others for new town centre uses. Sites 61 and 60 could be redeveloped together as they are so close together and cross subsidise / share uses across them. Again a policy saying that these need comprehensive treatment, as with sites 65 and 66 above, is required. And in the final plan they should be numbered the same with one line around them both: i.e. be one site. The plan correctly point out the small nature of premises in Shields and such buildings don't have parking associated with them when that's what is needed. So why are some of the few sites that could meet modern requirements being squandered for housing, especially in the absence of any other plans to boost the town as a town centre. Para. 6.66 is quite rightly says "Due to the dominance of small units in each of the Town Centres it is considered important that there are future sites for retail development that allow growth opportunities for retailers who would usually require larger floorplates than those currently available." Sites 61, 60 and 62 are available, and larger, sites: in the town centre and near to relatively main roads that surround the centre's core. Without a hard copy plan to scale, it seems that Sites 61 and 62 (and perhaps 60) could accommodate the</p> | | Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). Therefore, the Council is keen to promote the reuse of brownfield land in town centres and the Local Plan looks to focus development within the main urban area. However, the need to deliver new homes is not looked at in isolation and Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) aims to pursue growth and regeneration of town centres by delivering new development, but only when this is appropriate and not detrimental to existing circumstances. This decision is also taken on consideration of the retail policies of the Plan, which identify future demand for, and criteria for the location of, additional retail provision across the borough.</p> <p>Whilst the current proposal is for housing, consideration will be given as to whether a mixed-use allocation would be more appropriate. In such a case, proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and retail uses.</p> <p>There could be an opportunity to consider a group of sites within North Shields town centre (potentially including Sites 60 to 66) a wider strategy for the area, reflecting a need for a regeneration programme in this area to help manage change.</p> <p>The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | size of unit that para. 6.66 says is required. Certainly the current building on sites 61 and 60 are very bulky: so there is a great opportunity to be realised by replacing these with (far better designed) new 'bulky' retail or leisure buildings to provide the space and formats that modern operations prefer. Somewhat ironically, site 60 used to be the old NTC Planning Dept. office, now being proposed for just 5 houses. We can, and should, do better than that. Agree with comments for 61 and 62 about loss of car parking, and those comments are just from a traffic and transport viewpoint. Town vitality needs/considerations also mean parking shouldn't be lost, or it just drives people elsewhere. | | | One priority of Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) is to enhance accessibility by all modes of transport and any proposals which would result in the loss of existing car parking would have to be carefully considered through the planning process, including the resulting impact on existing shopping and community facilities. | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151754 | Site 60: Object to these being designated, promoted or anything else, for housing. Again these are sites more suitable than many others for new town centre uses. Sites 61 and 60 could be redeveloped together as they are so close together and cross subsidise / share uses across them. Again a policy saying that these need comprehensive treatment, as with sites 65 and 66 above, is required. And in the final plan they should be numbered the same with one line around them both: i.e. be one site. The plan correctly point out the small nature of premises in Shields and such buildings don't have parking associated | Site 60 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). Therefore, the Council is keen to promote the reuse of brownfield land in town centres and the Local Plan looks to focus development within the main urban area. However, the need to deliver new homes is not looked at in isolation and Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) aims to pursue growth and regeneration of town centres by delivering new development, but only when this is appropriate and not detrimental to existing circumstances. This decision is also taken on consideration of the retail policies of the Plan, which identify future demand for, and criteria for the location of, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>with them when that's what is needed. So why are some of the few sites that could meet modern requirements being squandered for housing, especially in the absence of any other plans to boost the town as a town centre. Para. 6.66 is quite rightly says "Due to the dominance of small units in each of the Town Centres it is considered important that there are future sites for retail development that allow growth opportunities for retailers who would usually require larger floorplates than those currently available." Sites 61, 60 and 62 are available, and larger, sites: in the town centre and near to relatively main roads that surround the centre's core. Without a hard copy plan to scale, it seems that Sites 61 and 62 (and perhaps 60) could accommodate the size of unit that para. 6.66 says is required. Certainly the current building on sites 61 and 60 are very bulky: so there is a great opportunity to be realised by replacing these with (far better designed) new 'bulky' retail or leisure buildings to provide the space and formats that modern operations prefer. Somewhat ironically, site 60 used to be the old NTC Planning Dept. office, now being proposed for just 5 houses. We can, and should, do better than that.</p> | | | <p>additional retail provision across the borough.</p> <p>Whilst the current proposal is for housing, consideration will be given as to whether a mixed-use allocation would be more appropriate. In such a case, proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and retail uses.</p> <p>There could be an opportunity to consider a group of sites within North Shields town centre (potentially including Sites 60 to 66) a wider strategy for the area, reflecting a need for a regeneration programme in this area to help manage change.</p> <p>The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable.</p> <p>One priority of Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) is to enhance accessibility by all modes of transport and any proposals which would result in the loss of existing car parking would have to be carefully considered through the planning process, including the resulting impact on existing shopping and community facilities.</p> | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151755 | Sites 62: Object to these being designated, promoted or anything else, | Site 62 | S 7.3 Distribution of | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>for housing. Again these are sites more suitable than many others for new town centre uses. Sites 61 and 60 could be redeveloped together as they are so close together and cross subsidise / share uses across them. Again a policy saying that these need comprehensive treatment, as with sites 65 and 66 above, is required. And in the final plan they should be numbered the same with one line around them both: i.e. be one site. The plan correctly point out the small nature of premises in Shields and such buildings don't have parking associated with them when that's what is needed. So why are some of the few sites that could meet modern requirements being squandered for housing, especially in the absence of any other plans to boost the town as a town centre. Para. 6.66 is quite rightly says "Due to the dominance of small units in each of the Town Centres it is considered important that there are future sites for retail development that allow growth opportunities for retailers who would usually require larger floorplates than those currently available." Sites 61, 60 and 62 are available, and larger, sites: in the town centre and near to relatively main roads that surround the centre's core. Without a hard copy plan to scale, it seems that Sites 61 and 62 (and perhaps 60) could accommodate the</p> | | Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). Therefore, the Council is keen to promote the reuse of brownfield land in town centres and the Local Plan looks to focus development within the main urban area. However, the need to deliver new homes is not looked at in isolation and Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) aims to pursue growth and regeneration of town centres by delivering new development, but only when this is appropriate and not detrimental to existing circumstances. This decision is also taken on consideration of the retail policies of the Plan, which identify future demand for, and criteria for the location of, additional retail provision across the borough.</p> <p>Whilst the current proposal is for housing, consideration will be given as to whether a mixed-use allocation would be more appropriate. In such a case, proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and retail uses.</p> <p>There could be an opportunity to consider a group of sites within North Shields town centre (potentially including Sites 60 to 66) a wider strategy for the area, reflecting a need for a regeneration programme in this area to help manage change.</p> <p>The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | size of unit that para. 6.66 says is required. Certainly the current building on sites 61 and 60 are very bulky: so there is a great opportunity to be realised by replacing these with (far better designed) new 'bulky' retail or leisure buildings to provide the space and formats that modern operations prefer. Somewhat ironically, site 60 used to be the old NTC Planning Dept. office, now being proposed for just 5 houses. We can, and should, do better than that. Agree with comments for 61 and 62 about loss of car parking, and those comments are just from a traffic and transport viewpoint. Town vitality needs/considerations also mean parking shouldn't be lost, or it just drives people elsewhere. | | | One priority of Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) is to enhance accessibility by all modes of transport and any proposals which would result in the loss of existing car parking would have to be carefully considered through the planning process, including the resulting impact on existing shopping and community facilities. | |
| 804019 | Owen Pugh Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151766 | Site 2: Background As you will be aware Fairhurst have previously made submissions on behalf of OP in response to NTC's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in October 2008, and subsequently in response to NTC's 5 Year Housing Land Supply Assessment in July 2012 and the 2014 SHLAA. The previous submissions related to the Owen Pugh site at Grieves Row in Dudley and a small triangular parcel of land to the south of the site which forms part of NTC's 5 Year Housing Land Supply. Fairhurst also made representation on behalf of OP in relation to the North Tyneside Local Plan Consultation in | Site 2 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Comments with regard to the future intentions for this site are noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. As highlighted, it is acknowledged that the site could potentially deliver a higher yield than the 64 dwellings identified in LPCD 2015. The 2014 SHLAA does indicate a yield of 90 dwellings, based on the evidence provided by landowner and agent, something which was unfortunately not reflected in the Local Plan due to a lag in time between the respective publication dates. In the next the yield will be revised to 90, aligning with the SHLAA. The | Site yield revised to 90 dwellings in line with 2015 SHLAA |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>December 2013. In the most recent submission, in July 2012 and September 2014, Fairhurst provided an update on the forecasted delivery of the Grieves Row site and elaborated on previous supporting information by providing demonstration that the sustainable development of the sites could serve social, economic and environmental roles as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). We have enclosed the previous representations from 2008, 2012, 2013 and 2014 as a background to this submission. North Tyneside Local Plan: Consultation 2015 In the recently published Consultation of the North Tyneside Local Plan, a number of sites are identified as "preferred locations for housing development" through the SHLAA 2014. The Grieves Row site is identified as "Map ref. 2: Grieves Row, Dudley" in the list in Chapter 7, section S7.3 of the Consultation . It is stated that the site is brownfield land and that it has the capacity to accommodate 64 dwellings. Having spoken directly with officers from NTC planning department we understand that the council have accepted that the site can deliver 90 dwellings in the SHLAA and that the site has been recognised as being "deliverable" in 0-5 years. In this regard, the SHLAA (January 2015) in "Appendix 3: 2014/2015 " Schedule of Deliverable</p> | | | <p>complimentary role that Site 140 can play, as part of a wider development, is accepted. The negative impact on residential amenity resulting from current operations, including from HGV traffic, is recognised and is reflected through the proposal to allocate this site for residential use, rather than employment land as in the UDP. The relationship with adjacent sites which are proposed to remain in employment/industrial uses will have to be carefully considered through site layout and design.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Sites' under site reference 95, identifies the site for the delivery of 90 units, with an estimated delivery strategy of 30 units within years 1 " " 5 and 60 units within years 5 " " 10. OP consider that a higher yield would deliver a mix of housing type to meet the needs of the area. Fairhurst consider that stating that the housing site could only deliver 64 units may prejudice decisions on future proposals. OP request that the potential housing yield figure is increased to allow more flexibility, so that development proposals can meet current housing needs in line with the 2014 SHLAA. Consequently, this allocation should actually read 90 dwellings in line with the above, based on the 2014 iteration of the SHLAA and previous representations made to the council as outlined above. The site area is approximately 3 hectares in size.</p> <p>"Map ref. site 140: the small triangular area to the south of Grieves Row, Dudley' is listed as the former Miners Welfare Centre, greenfield and able to accommodate 7 dwellings. Please note that this site, we consider, to be brownfield as this parcel of land was left undeveloped following the demolition and removal of the former miner welfare buildings. Update and Delivery of the site to Housing As previously outlined by Fairhurst in past representations, the Grieves Row site</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>is no longer suitable for employment use given the residential character of the area and the negative impact it has on residential amenity. Additionally, the existing transport infrastructure is no longer adequate to support employment use on site. The continuing emerging Local Plan is expected to provide a development framework for the sustainable growth and development of North Tyneside for the next fifteen years. To be found sound, the evidence base of the emerging Local Plan will need to be informed by up to date information regarding the availability of land from landowners. OP can confirm that, although the current use of the site is employment use, we expect to vacate the site, facilitating the development of housing on the site in the next 2 years. As identified in previous submissions, OP considers that the redevelopment of the site for housing would represent logical, sustainable development based on the following:</p> <p>"ç The redevelopment of the site will enable the company to relocate to suitable premises which meet their business requirements; "ç The site is no longer suitable for employment use given the residential character of the area and the negative impact it has on residential amenity; "ç The existing transport infrastructure is no longer adequate to support employment use</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>on site; "ç Housing development on the site represents sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF; "ç The site is brownfield land; The site can be readily integrated into the adjoining residential areas and is highly sustainable due to its close proximity to a wide range of services, as identified in previously submitted representations; "ç The suitability of the area for housing has been proven by other recent housing developments in the Dudley area; "ç Development of the site will present Dudley with a significant regeneration opportunity which will result in a benefit to the immediate surroundings and the local community through a sensitively designed residential development providing an increased housing choice in the locality; and "ç Redevelopment of the site would prioritise sustainable methods of transport including pedestrian movement, cycling and public transport. The delivery of the Grieves Row site has been delayed for the last six years due to market conditions during the recent recession, however, we can confirm that the site remains available and it is the company's intention to relocate the new headquarters for our business activities and main operations in the short-term i.e. within the next 2 years. We can also update and confirm that the relocation is required from the</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Grieves Row site in the very near future for operational purposes because the site is currently too small for the activities taking place on it and is therefore hindering the further growth and expansion of the company. In addition, the facilities on the site are now out of date and require continual expenditure for upgrading and maintenance to accommodate the business. This highlights that it is within our commercial interest to relocate from Grieves Row as soon as possible. In this regard, we are currently in the process of planning relocating from the Grieves Row site to an alternative site in our ownership and have undertaken discussions with the relevant planning authority to progress with the development of the alternative premises. Additionally, a further substantial site has more recently come to our attention which could house our headquarters and main operations within the group. These premises are of serious interest to the company and discussions are ongoing with the owners. Benefits of Alternative Uses There is also benefit to the local community to a timely redevelopment of the site as it is no longer considered to be an appropriate location for employment uses. Please see the previous representations to the to the 5 Year Housing Land Supply made in June 2012 (attached) which</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>demonstrate that continued use of the site for employment is considered to be outdated. The surrounding area is now predominantly residential in nature with the residential estate of 'Meadow Bank' located to the east, 'Ford View' to the north east, 'Bamborough Court' to the south and McNulty Court to the south west. The prevailing winds in the area are westerly, with the consequent result that during dry and windy periods, dust from the site can blow towards the residential area of 'Meadow Bank'. In addition to the above, vehicle movements from the site have been known to cause disturbance to the local properties, and although both ourselves and S & B Eps Ltd are operating in accordance with the relevant permissions and consents, the now residential character of the neighbourhood defines that both businesses hold records of complaints from the local community. The site has two accesses both taken from Grieves Row (the B1319) on the eastern boundary. We take access from a mini roundabout shared with the modern 'Meadow Bank' residential development to the east. S & B Eps Ltd also takes access via Grieves Row, approximately 50 metres north of the mini roundabout. The S & B Eps access is provided as a T junction from the existing road. The width of the road in</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>this location is not sufficient to allow an HGV to enter or exit the site in one manoeuvre, and the access is often the cause of congestion on Grieves Row during operational hours. Given the existing constraints and predominantly residential character of the area, the continued employment use of the site is considered to be outdated. Housing development on site could be designed to have significant amenity enhancements to the occupiers of dwellings on site, and also the existing residents of the surrounding neighbourhoods. It would bring about improvements in terms of noise, dust and traffic congestion. Conclusion In conclusion, we consider that current evidence demonstrates that the Grieves Row site is suitable, available and deliverable for housing development and that the redevelopment of the Grieves Row site is logical in planning and sustainability terms. We plan and anticipate relocating from the site in the short-term i.e. within the next 2 years to new headquarter premises which shall benefit the continued growth and expansion of the company. The ongoing allocation of the site for housing development would respond to the company's business needs and enable the regeneration of a brownfield site to deliver much needed housing in an accessible location. The</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | size of the site shall easily accommodate 90 dwelling on the Grieves Row site and 7 dwellings on the triangular parcel of land, that being the former Miners Welfare Centre. | | | | |
| 804019 | Owen Pugh Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151768 | Site 140: the small triangular area to the south of Grieves Row, Dudley' is listed as the former Miners Welfare Centre, greenfield and able to accommodate 7 dwellings. Please note that this site, we consider, to be brownfield as this parcel of land was left undeveloped following the demolition and removal of the former miner welfare buildings. | Site 140 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. NPPF includes a definition of brownfield land (or PDL) and, following further consideration, that this site does meet this criteria. Site record to be amended in the Local Plan and the SHLAA. | Change to brownfield? (DH still to do this) |
| 808917 | BDW North East | LAND DEVELOPER | LP20151776 | BDW support the new housing sites allocated but would like to see more sites allocated. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032, including the sites specifically highlighted in this representation. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now AS4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. | |
| 900308 | Places for People | | LP20151791 | New site: (Comments with input from Urban Splash) We would question the exclusion of the Marine Gardens/Coquet Avenue site which is situated in a priority investment area. | Site 48 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is included in the Local Plan as a suggested site residential development for 41 dwellings. See Site 48 - Site at Coquet Avenue, Whitley Bay. | No amendments proposed. |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151798 | Policy S7.3 identifies a wide range of preferred locations for housing development, and includes welcome reference to flood risk mitigation as a consideration in the selection of preferred sites from those identified in the SHLAA process. We would however suggest that critical infrastructure capacity should also form an explicit consideration within this policy. It is welcome to note a number of brownfield development opportunities within the sites identified in Policy S7.3, which present the potential for the removal of surface water from the combined sewerage system. The sustainable drainage of previously developed sites serves to increase available capacity in both the sewerage network and Howdon STW. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for brownfield development and the role this could play in dealing with removal of surface water is noted. There are a range of Local Plan policies which relate to water management and flood risk and a newly introduced policy focused on water quality. Together this range of policies set out the Council's preferred approach. In addition to this, the IDP sets out any improvements necessary to water infrastructure in order to tackle both current and future constraints, including those already programmed. However, further consideration will be given as to whether there is need to amend Policy S7.3 (now S4.3) in light of comments. The Council will continue to work with NWL in order to deliver development over the plan period which is sustainable. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151813 | Site 28: This site is allocated as a preferred housing development site on the Local Plan Policies Map. The Northumberland Estates supports the identification of this site for housing, and following the granting of planning permission in January 2015 | Site 28 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site was granted planning permission in January 2015, after the publication of LPCD 2015. In the next of the Plan this will be identified as a 'large site with planning permission'. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | (14/01687/OUT), note that the Policies Map should reflect this by being designated a "Large Site with Planning Permission", rather than an allocated housing site. | | | | |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151814 | Site 29: This site is allocated as a preferred mixed use site on the Local Plan Policies Map. The Northumberland Estates support the identification of this site for mixed use development including housing and employment land. The site is subject to an existing planning application (12/00637/FUL) for housing (67 dwellings) including road infrastructure, structural landscaping, gardens and public amenity space. This application is yet to be determined but is viewed as acceptable in principle, subject to meeting normal development control criteria. The Local Plan currently designates the site as a "Local Wildlife Site". It is considered that this designation is not supported by ecological evidence and will prevent development from being progressed. It is considered that there is an inconsistency within the Local Plan between allocating this site for mixed employment and residential use, as well as a Local Wildlife Site. The attached Ecology Survey submitted alongside these representations demonstrates that Backworth Business Park and Cottages has limited ecological value. Therefore it is | Site 29 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>This site is proposed for mixed-use allocation, a reflection of the Council's desire to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals would not simply be for residential redevelopment but could involve some housing supported by, and integrated with, employment uses. In this, the Council is aware of the needs and requirements of existing businesses and there is no proposal that existing landowners or users will be forced to vacate the site.</p> <p>The application in question (12/00637/FUL) was refused in May 2015 and it is apparent that there are still significant obstacles to delivery. These include the ecological site constraints and, principally, important issues relating to the operation of existing business which will need to be mitigated/overcome before development is acceptable. It is considered that a 65 units scheme, as part of a mixed-use allocation, is still possible for this wider site but deliverability in the short-term is questionable.</p> <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | considered that the Local Plan should remove the Local Wildlife Site designation in order to progress development at this site. | | | designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. | |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151815 | Site 73: The Northumberland Estates supports the allocation of Site 73 for housing development, as identified on the Policies Map. Proposals for housing will be prepared and submitted to North Tyneside Council within the plan period. | Site 73 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151816 | Site 70: The Northumberland Estates support the allocation of Site 70 for housing development, as identified on the Policies Map. Proposals for housing have been prepared and submitted to North Tyneside Council and will be brought forward in the plan period. | Site 70 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151817 | Fenwick's Pit, East Holywell Village This site is not allocated in the Local Plan, but The Northumberland Estates consider it to be suitable for development. The site is located within the Green Belt, however it is previously developed land. Therefore, under the NPPF (paragraph 89) this site is able to be re-developed. It is considered that the Local Plan should recognise this as a potential development opportunity, and this should be reflected on the Policies Map. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 11 now Site E0102). The SHLAA currently concludes that this site is unsuitable for residential development. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151818 | Site 22 - 26: Sites 22 and 26 are in the ownership of The Northumberland Estates and comprise the land adjacent to the A19 of the Killingworth Moor allocated development site on the Local Plan Policies Map. The A19 Corridor is a key economic driver of regional significance to which future development needs stand to be directed. Both sites are proposed for residential and employment use as part of the wider Killingworth Moor development. Within Killingworth Moor, sites 22 and 26 are sustainably located in close proximity to local services and facilities, and readily accessible by public and private transport. These sites can achieve a sustainable future for North Tyneside, meeting the housing and employment needs of the local communities. The development of these sites also provides a significant opportunity to promote and enhance the natural environment, notably the proposed wildlife corridor marked on the Local Plan Policies Map. Significant work has already been undertaken into specific issues, including highway access, flooding and drainage, landscape and ecology. Further work will be undertaken in conjunction with other landowners of the Killingworth Moor site to produce a wider Masterplan for the site, and this will be prepared in discussion with North Tyneside | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. As highlighted, a comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This is being undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including landowners and statutory bodies, including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date relating to highway access, flooding and drainage, landscape and ecology. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | Council. | | | | |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151819 | Site 41: This site comprises the south-eastern area of the Murton allocated development site on the Local Plan Policies Map. The eastern corner of this site is within the ownership of The Northumberland Estates. This site is allocated for preferred housing development. The Northumberland Estates supports this allocation, and it is considered that site 41 is sustainably located to local services and facilities, and easily accessible by public transport. Housing development at this site will help to meet the housing need of local communities in North Tyneside, located adjacent to Monkseaton High School and adjacent to North Tyneside General Hospital the site can be developed without impacting upon the amenity of other residential areas. Significant work has already been undertaken into specific issues, including highway access, flooding and drainage, landscape and ecology. Further work will be undertaken in conjunction with other landowners of the wider Murton site to produce a Masterplan for the site, and this will be prepared in discussion with North Tyneside Council. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. As highlighted, a comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This is being undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including landowners and statutory bodies, including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date relating to highway access, flooding and drainage, landscape and ecology. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 900403 | | RESIDENT | LP20151821 | Site 21: I am writing to you to save the only playing field the children of Holystone have to play on. As your map on your website shows the | Site 21 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | nearest playing field apart from this one is across the very busy A19 road. As a caring council I would think you would want to protect our children. If this plan goes ahead and children are injured or killed because of your actions, the councillors of today will be held responsible for their actions. Do the right and caring thing - Do not build on our children's playing field. | | Development Sites | and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision, including enabling safe access. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. This includes improvements to cycling and walking infrastructure, integral to any proposal, and ensuring safe access. | |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151830 | A number of the potential development sites are located in Flood Zones 3 and 2 and as such are at high/medium flood risk. We support that the proposed allocations within these flood risk areas are supported by a Flood Risk Sequential and Exception Test. Welcome that in allocating these sites a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development has been undertaken to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change. | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for the approach taken in the allocation process is noted. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency in order to deliver development over the plan period which is sustainable and which avoids flood risk wherever possible. There are a range of Local Plan policies which relate to water management and flood risk and a newly introduced policy focused on water quality. Together this range of policies set out the Council's preferred approach. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151831 | Site 3: The site is adjacent to Sandy's Letch watercourse and is partially within Flood Zone 3 and 2 (High/Medium Flood Risk). Should this site be allocated we consider that the layout should seek to avoid development in these areas. | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors, this includes the impact that development could have on flood risk. In this, the partial designation of this site within Flood Zone 2 and 3 is acknowledged. However careful | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Development that encroaches on watercourses has a potentially severe impact on their ecological value and the land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected. We consider that there is a need to provide coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. In developing the site there are opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around the development. On this basis, we consider that any allocation should ensure the protection of the watercourse through providing an appropriate buffer zone to the watercourse that is free from development. As outlined urban diffuse pollution is a particular pressure on the water quality of urban watercourses in North Tyneside. We consider that any development will need to manage surface water quality. On this basis, we would recommend that a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy will be required that demonstrates there is adequate foul and surface water capacity for the development the aim of reducing flood risk and ensuring no deterioration of water quality. We consider that in developing the site there is the need for an overall ambition to limit surface water drainage from the proposed development site in order to manage</p> | | | <p>consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. This includes impacts on existing watercourses and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable - specifically this includes consideration of a buffer zone to Sandy's Letch.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency in order to deliver development over the plan period which is sustainable and which avoids flood risk wherever possible. There are a range of Local Plan policies which relate to water management and flood risk and a newly introduced policy focused on water quality. Together this range of policies set out the Council's preferred approach. The requirement for a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy will be considered.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | wider flood risks. The mechanisms for flooding within the area are complex and on this basis we consider that consideration is given to a range of flood risk scenarios. | | | | |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151833 | Site 22 - 26: These sites are adjacent to watercourses including the Seaton burn. Development that encroaches on watercourses has a potentially severe impact on their ecological value and the land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected. We consider that there is a need to provide coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. In developing these site there are opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around the development. On this basis, we consider that there are opportunities to master plan a wider green infrastructure strategy including the protection of the watercourses through providing an appropriate buffer zone to the watercourse that is free from development. As outlined urban diffuse pollution is a particular pressure on the water quality of urban watercourses in North Tyneside. We consider that any development will need to manage surface water quality. On this basis, we would recommend that the opportunity is taken to master plan a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy will be required that | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors, this includes the impact that development could have on flood risk. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. This includes impacts on existing watercourses and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable - specifically this includes consideration of a buffer zone to the Seaton Burn. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency in order to deliver development over the plan period which is sustainable and which avoids flood risk wherever possible. There are a range of Local Plan policies which relate to water management and flood risk and a newly introduced policy focused on water quality. Together this range of policies set out the Council's preferred approach. The requirement for a Foul and Surface Water | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | demonstrates there is adequate foul and surface water capacity for the development the aim of reducing flood risk and ensuring no deterioration of water quality. We consider that in developing the site there is the need for an overall ambition to limit surface water drainage from the proposed development site in order to manage wider flood risks. The mechanisms for flooding within the area are complex and on this basis we consider that consideration is given to a range of flood risk scenarios. | | | Drainage Strategy and potentially for a masterplan for green infrastructure will be considered. | |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151834 | Site 27: These sites are adjacent to watercourses including the Seaton burn. Development that encroaches on watercourses has a potentially severe impact on their ecological value and the land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected. We consider that there is a need to provide coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. In developing these site there are opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around the development. On this basis, we consider that there are opportunities to master plan a wider green infrastructure strategy including the protection of the watercourses through providing an appropriate buffer zone to the watercourse that is free from development. As outlined | Site 27 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors, this includes the impact that development could have on flood risk. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. This includes impacts on existing watercourses and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable - specifically this includes consideration of a buffer zone to the Seaton Burn. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency in order to deliver | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>urban diffuse pollution is a particular pressure on the water quality of urban watercourses in North Tyneside. We consider that any development will need to manage surface water quality. On this basis, we would recommend that the opportunity is taken to master plan a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy will be required that demonstrates there is adequate foul and surface water capacity for the development the aim of reducing flood risk and ensuring no deterioration of water quality. We consider that in developing the site there is the need for an overall ambition to limit surface water drainage from the proposed development site in order to manage wider flood risks. The mechanisms for flooding within the area are complex and on this basis we consider that consideration is given to a range of flood risk scenarios.</p> | | | <p>development over the plan period which is sustainable and which avoids flood risk wherever possible. There are a range of Local Plan policies which relate to water management and flood risk and a newly introduced policy focused on water quality. Together this range of policies set out the Council's preferred approach. The requirement for a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy and potentially for a masterplan for green infrastructure will be considered.</p> | |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151835 | <p>Site 28: These sites are adjacent to watercourses including the Seaton burn. Development that encroaches on watercourses has a potentially severe impact on their ecological value and the land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected. We consider that there is a need to provide coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. In developing these site there are opportunities to</p> | Site 28 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors, this includes the impact that development could have on flood risk. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>incorporate biodiversity in and around the development. On this basis, we consider that there are opportunities to master plan a wider green infrastructure strategy including the protection of the watercourses through providing an appropriate buffer zone to the watercourse that is free from development. As outlined urban diffuse pollution is a particular pressure on the water quality of urban watercourses in North Tyneside. We consider that any development will need to manage surface water quality. On this basis, we would recommend that the opportunity is taken to master plan a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy will be required that demonstrates there is adequate foul and surface water capacity for the development the aim of reducing flood risk and ensuring no deterioration of water quality. We consider that in developing the site there is the need for an overall ambition to limit surface water drainage from the proposed development site in order to manage wider flood risks. The mechanisms for flooding within the area are complex and on this basis we consider that consideration is given to a range of flood risk scenarios.</p> | | | <p>new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. This includes impacts on existing watercourses and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable - specifically this includes consideration of a buffer zone to the Seaton Burn. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency in order to deliver development over the plan period which is sustainable and which avoids flood risk wherever possible. There are a range of Local Plan policies which relate to water management and flood risk and a newly introduced policy focused on water quality. Together this range of policies set out the Council's preferred approach. The requirement for a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy and potentially for a masterplan for green infrastructure will be considered.</p> | |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151836 | <p>Site 29: Within the development site there is an area of culverted water course. We would recommend that any redevelopment would seek the</p> | Site 29 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors, this includes the impact that development could have on</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | removal of the culvert to re-establish river and bankside habitat and the continuity of the watercourse corridor. | | Development Sites | <p>flood risk. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. In this case, specific consideration is necessary of the existing culverted watercourse. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency in order to deliver development over the plan period which is sustainable and which avoids flood risk wherever possible. There are a range of Local Plan policies which relate to water management and flood risk and a newly introduced policy focused on water quality. Together this range of policies set out the Council's preferred approach.</p> | |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151837 | Site 35 - 41: These sites are adjacent to a number watercourses. Development that encroaches on watercourses has a potentially severe impact on their ecological value and the land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected. We consider that there is a need to provide coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. In developing these site there are opportunities to incorporate | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors, this includes the impact that development could have on flood risk. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>biodiversity in and around the development. On this basis, we consider that there are opportunities to master plan a wider green infrastructure strategy including the protection of the watercourses through providing an appropriate buffer zone to the watercourse that is free from development. As outlined urban diffuse pollution is a particular pressure on the water quality of urban watercourses in North Tyneside. We consider that any development will need to manage surface water quality. On this basis, we would recommend that the opportunity is taken to master plan a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy will be required that demonstrates there is adequate foul and surface water capacity for the development the aim of reducing flood risk and ensuring no deterioration of water quality. We consider that in developing the site there is the need for an overall ambition to limit surface water drainage from the proposed development site in order to manage wider flood risks. The mechanisms for flooding within the area are complex and on this basis we consider that consideration is given to a range of flood risk scenarios.</p> | | | <p>new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. This includes impacts on existing watercourses and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable - specifically this includes consideration of a buffer zone to the Seaton Burn. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency in order to deliver development over the plan period which is sustainable and which avoids flood risk wherever possible. There are a range of Local Plan policies which relate to water management and flood risk and a newly introduced policy focused on water quality. Together this range of policies set out the Council's preferred approach. The requirement for a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy and potentially for a masterplan for green infrastructure will be considered.</p> | <p>exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |
| 396324 | Newcastle Airport | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151840 | <p>New Site (SHLAA ref: 339): As previously discussed with the authority, NIA owns an area of land known as the Benton Curve. This land</p> | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | <p>Comments noted. As indicated, this land was formerly identified as 'safeguarded' for strategic transport purposes in order to protect a</p> | <p>No amendment proposed.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>was reserved for a potential heavy rail link to the airport through track sharing with Nexus. NIA agreed with the local authority in 2014 that this land was no longer required for this purpose, the land then being considered as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The land has not been allocated for housing within the SHLAA, being discounted for reasons of lack of assessment primarily in relation to transport and trees. The land was discounted prior to NIA being made aware of this, and NIA would welcome the opportunity to work with the authority to provide the required information to take a view on the acceptability of the scheme for housing, with a view to then having the land allocated, were this appropriate. This land has been allocated in this plan as green or open space. Again, NIA was not consulted on this allocation and considers it inappropriate for the following reasons: Considering its potential allocation as 'Open Space', the site has not previously been allocated for this use, and is not open to the public, being closed off via gates and closed board fencing. There is no access to the site to the public and NIA would not consider providing this facility to the local community for this site, having rejected previous requests by the local</p> | | Development Sites | <p>potential heavy rail connection to Newcastle International Airport. However this was removed from LPCD 2015 following advice from NIA.</p> <p>The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032.</p> <p>Site 128 is included for assessment in the SHLAA (Site 339) and has been considered as a potential housing allocation through the Local Plan process. However, following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space.</p> <p>NIA's view on the future role of the site is acknowledged. This current consultation exercise is the opportunity to submit further evidence and comment to help shape the decision-making process moving forward. It is acknowledged that a range of additional work is being undertaken to provide further evidence of suitability for residential allocation. The Council encourages the landowner to continue to engage positively through the consultation process. The range of residential allocations will be further refined for the Local Plan Publication, with the representations to the</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>community to do so. Considering an allocation as "Green Space' the designation of Local Green Space is outlined within the National Planning Policy Framework and the accompanying Planning Practice Guidance. The guidance states that: The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used: "where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; "where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and "where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. The site does not meet any of the criteria outlined, with the following justification. "As outlined above, the land is not open to the public. As such it could not be considered to serve the community to any great extent and has no recreational value. "Up until recently the land was reserved for development of a heavy rail link it being located adjacent to both the metro, light rail and national rail line. The site is also subject to significant antisocial behaviour in the form of</p> | | | current consultation and any further evidence being key in guiding these final decisions. | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>flytipping, drug/alcohol abuse, arson etc, with people illegally entering the site for this activity. On this basis we do not consider that the site could be considered to be of great tranquillity. "ç The site whilst a former railway line, is not considered to be historically valuable or of any significance to the region or local community. "ç A tree survey carried out by a competent arborist considers that the trees on site are in large of poor quality, with only a small number within the site, of good quality. Whilst the trees offer some limited amenity value in terms of greenery, the site could not be considered to be "special', "significant' or of particular beauty above that of any existing well vegetated garden or landscaped boundary treatment. "ç The site has no wildlife designations, other than the plans proposal to run the wildlife corridor through it. NIA is not aware of any habitat surveys having been undertaken for the site and does not consider how the authority could be of the view currently that the site provides a richness of wildlife on the site. NIA would request that designation of the site as "Open or Green Space' should be removed from the plan. I would be happy to meet with the relevant offices to discuss this further.</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|--|---|---|
| 900513 | | RESIDENT | LP20151841 | <p>Site 35 to 41: In 1987 North Tyneside Council appealed against Leech Homes to stop similar building in and around Murton. The Council gave such strong arguments that, at a public meeting in 1986, the Government Inspector J. Trevor Graham ruled on the Council's favour. Your arguments still pertain in the light of this new proposed development (please see your copy of the findings). Murton Village is unique. It is the only open space used by walkers, joggers, bike riders, horse riders. Frequented by migrating birds etc. I strongly oppose this proposed urbanisation. Brownfield sites should be explored first.</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Comment noted with regard to previous proposal for development. Even following allocation, a planning application(s) for the proposed strategic site will require approval before any development can commence. Such an application will be judged on merit through the development management process.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | |
| 900514 | | RESIDENT | LP20151842 | Site 35 to 41: the unique identity of the village and surroundings must be preserved in order to maintain a sense of community and preserve wildlife habitats, especially hedgerows. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 469684 | | RESIDENT | LP20151844 | Site 35 to 41: Murton - oppose due to: 1) Environmental destruction. 2) Loss of amenity on public footpaths/buildings. Wildlife corridor appreciated, but building would: 1) Destroy habitat of endangered farm birds, especially red-listed skylarks and grey partridge, which need fields for | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | nesting on the ground. We are lucky to have them. 2) Add to surface water drainage problems in West Monkseaton as far as Bromley Avenue. If some of land has to be used I suggest NOT sites 37, 38, 39 & 40. | | | appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The specific impact on identified wildlife, including any endangered species, will be carefully considered, with mitigation measures developed as required. This process will be informed by relevant experts. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 900515 | | RESIDENT | LP20151850 | Site 35 to 41: As previous, I object due to traffic problems. Also there is supposed to be a covenant allowing the 1156 Air Cadets use of the fields for training! | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Any issues relating to current use of this land will have to be resolved, and mitigated as necessary, in the most appropriate manner. | shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 900515 | | RESIDENT | LP20151851 | New site: alternative site (to Murton) between Asda and Rising Sun Park. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Suggested noted. However this area of land is within the boundary of the Rising Sun Country Park and is considered to be unsuitable for housing development. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 900517 | | RESIDENT | LP20151853 | Site 52: This site is used by children to play on which means they are a safe distance from home and for parents to keep an eye on them. The junction leading down both Deepdale and Derwent gets busy and is already tight. Lots of pedestrians use this road for getting to schools - more traffic would be dangerous. | Site 52 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. | |
| 900519 | | RESIDENT | LP20151855 | New site: Not far from St Aidan's Church in Coach Lane are two large playing fields - working with Newcastle could some of this land not be re-designated? Are these playing fields fully used? | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The area to the east of Coach Lane (south of Site 15) is designated open space, much of which is occupied by existing sports pitches and associated facilities. At the current time, this area is not available for housing development and is well-used for recreation and leisure. Therefore, being unsuitable, it has not been considered as a potential allocation through the Local Plan. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 900519 | | RESIDENT | LP20151856 | Site 17: (plus brown area near the roundabout) - we object to these open spaces - once they are gone the urban sprawl will continue (see suggested alternative sites on Coach Lane). | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | |
| 900519 | | RESIDENT | LP20151857 | Site 11 now Site E0101: we object to these open spaces - once they are gone the urban sprawl will continue. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 900519 | | RESIDENT | LP20151858 | Site 139: we object to these open spaces - once they are gone the urban sprawl will continue. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | Sites | <p>year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites</p> <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> | |
| 900521 | | RESIDENT | LP20151862 | Site 35 to 41: object to development of roads and houses on this site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | detailed masterplanning. |
| 900521 | | RESIDENT | LP20151863 | New site: there are more green fields in Dudley, East Holywell, Seghill, Seaton Burn and Wideopen for houses and roads. | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Much of the land in the north and north west of the borough is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt, with some of this being assessed in the SHLAA. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 807291 | | RESIDENT | LP20151865 | Sites 22 to 26: I object to development - loss of wildlife habitat, congestion of roads with increase of traffic. What started off as a village turning into a town! | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|--------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. | |
| 807291 | | RESIDENT | LP20151867 | New site: housing in Dudley | Distribution | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. A number of sites in Dudley and Annitsford have been identified as suggested allocations, which together would provide a significant number of new homes in this area of the borough, including Sites 2, 3, 118, 119, 132, 140, 142, 143. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 900541 | | RESIDENT | LP20151873 | Site 17: Building on more green field sites around Benton and the Rising Sun Park will destroy what is left of the open aspect and ignores the problems not being considered as follows. Traffic generation Totally inadequate road system Complete disrespect for the environment and existing residents No thought for providing car parking for encouraging metro use Using metro far too expensive in fair cost No thought for environmental impact of noise and | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>fumes resulting from dense and inappropriate housing layouts. Quality of housing unimaginative and very poor Impact of water supplies and flood risk with developments not considered....shown up with Longbenton drainage work costing several million and still not resolved. No wild life corridors or open spaces for residents to follow through new build up areas. Building on brown sites not being undertaken in other areas to alleviate housing need first. Questionable need for more housing when thousands of houses on the market and unsold. Character of area lost. Housing not needed until regional and local economy is improved and little being done about this basic need. Priorities in the plan are wrong Speculative faceless housing is not the answer to a housing need if economy improves. Housing choice from imaginative housing schemes needed: i.e. co-operative schemes, self build, green and pleasant well designed layouts - housing that considers our environment not boxes for profit.</p> | | | <p>delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to flood risk and , if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The Local Plan includes a range of policies to deliver new development which is attractively designed, including Policy DM9.2 (now DM6.1). The delivery of new homes using a variety of different methods is also encouraged with Policy DM7.9 (now DM4.6) setting out requirements for self-build schemes which would promote high-quality design and innovation. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. The Local Plan sets out a strategy to deliver this need over the long-term, a period likely to be subject to a number of economic fluctuations. | |
| 900541 | | RESIDENT | LP20151874 | Site 11 now Site E0101: Building on more green field sites around Benton and the Rising Sun Park will destroy what is left of the open aspect and ignores the problems not being considered as follows. Traffic generation Totally inadequate road system Complete disrespect for the environment and existing residents No thought for providing car parking for encouraging metro use Using metro far too expensive in fair cost No thought for environmental impact of noise and | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>fumes resulting from dense and inappropriate housing layouts. Quality of housing unimaginative and very poor Impact of water supplies and flood risk with developments not considered....shown up with Longbenton drainage work costing several million and still not resolved. No wild life corridors or open spaces for residents to follow through new build up areas. Building on brown sites not being undertaken in other areas to alleviate housing need first. Questionable need for more housing when thousands of houses on the market and unsold. Character of area lost. Housing not needed until regional and local economy is improved and little being done about this basic need. Priorities in the plan are wrong Speculative faceless housing is not the answer to a housing need if economy improves. Housing choice from imaginative housing schemes needed: i.e. co-operative schemes, self build, green and pleasant well designed layouts - housing that considers our environment not boxes for profit.</p> | | | <p>sites Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to flood risk and , if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The Local Plan includes a range of policies to deliver new development which is attractively designed, including Policy DM9.2 (nowDM6.1). The delivery of new homes using a variety of different methods is also encouraged with Policy DM7.9 (now DM4.6) setting out requirements for self-build schemes which would promote high-quality design and innovation.</p> <p>The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. The Local Plan sets out a strategy to deliver this need over the long-term, a period likely to be subject to a number of economic fluctuations.</p> | |
| 900541 | | RESIDENT | LP20151875 | <p>Site 139: Building on more green field sites around Benton and the Rising Sun Park will destroy what is left of the open aspect and ignores the problems not being considered as follows. Traffic generation Totally inadequate road system Complete disrespect for the environment and existing residents No thought for providing car parking for encouraging metro use Using metro far too expensive in fair cost No thought for environmental impact of noise and fumes resulting from dense and inappropriate housing layouts. Quality</p> | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>of housing unimaginative and very poor Impact of water supplies and flood risk with developments not considered....shown up with Longbenton drainage work costing several million and still not resolved. No wild life corridors or open spaces for residents to follow through new build up areas. Building on brown sites not being undertaken in other areas to alleviate housing need first. Questionable need for more housing when thousands of houses on the market and unsold. Character of area lost. Housing not needed until regional and local economy is improved and little being done about this basic need. Priorities in the plan are wrong Speculative faceless housing is not the answer to a housing need if economy improves. Housing choice from imaginative housing schemes needed: i.e. co-operative schemes, self build, green and pleasant well designed layouts - housing that considers our environment not boxes for profit.</p> | | | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to flood risk and , if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The Local Plan includes a range of policies to deliver new development which is attractively designed, including Policy DM9.2 (now S6.1). The delivery of new homes using a variety of different methods is also encouraged with Policy DM7.9 (now DM4.6) setting out requirements for self-build schemes which would promote high-quality design and innovation. The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. The Local Plan sets out a strategy to deliver this need over the long-term, a period likely to be subject to a number of economic fluctuations.</p> | |
| 591119 | | | LP20151888 | <p>Site 4: I am pleased that the small areas marked as site 4 and site 8 are now to be designated as Safeguarded land. Small compensation for the huge loss of all the other open spaces, most recently Whitehouse Farm "" a travesty of justice. Let's hope that really does mean it can't be developed unless there is nowhere else! To, once again imitate the words you used when describing your aims for Whitley Bay, " the aim is to reduce the concentration of these developments and support WEST MOOR to become / continue to be a sustainable community" .</p> | Site 4 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Support for proposed designation noted. Site 4 is included for assessment in the SHLAA (Site 333) and has been considered as a potential allocation for development through the Local Plan process. However, on consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retain as safeguarded land, potentially meeting the development needs of the borough post-2032.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| 591119 | | | LP20151889 | Site 8: I am pleased that the small areas marked as site 4 and site 8 are now to be designated as Safeguarded land. Small compensation for the huge loss of all the other open spaces, most recently Whitehouse Farm "" a travesty of justice. Let's hope that really does mean it can't be developed unless there is nowhere else! To, once again imitate the words you used when describing your aims for Whitley Bay, " the aim is to reduce the concentration of these developments and support WEST MOOR to become / continue to be a sustainable community" . | Site 8 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for proposed designation noted. Site 8 is included for assessment in the SHLAA (Site 056) and has been considered as a potential allocation for development through the Local Plan process. However, on consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retain as safeguarded land, potentially meeting the development needs of the borough post-2032. | No amendments proposed. |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151906 | Having met with Council Officers in advance of this being published we are very disappointed to see that they have not acted upon some of the ideas discussed in respect to the presentation of site allocations. There are several sites where it will not be either possible or appropriate to develop the full extent of the areas shown. We believe that the full development of such sites would be contrary to planning policy. It would be preferable to show on the proposals maps that not the whole site would be developed. This would give reassurance to local residents and interest groups that special features would be saved, that meaningful wildlife corridors and open spaces would be retained and that any constraints such as flooding are | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 4,500 homes, between the two sites, in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>avoided. This might then negate the need for objecting to some of the sites. It would also make it clearer to developers that it is anticipated that not the whole site would be developed, which should reduce the likelihood of inappropriate planning applications and planning appeals. There is a simple solution, which is to retain the site boundary line but to remove shading on part of the site where it is anticipated that development would not be appropriate. This could be indicative, for example there is an "Indicative Strategic Settlement Buffer" . An alternative to this would be to use a different form of shading to indicate that not the whole site would be built upon. We have indicated below those sites where we feel that clearer shading (or removal of shading) is required. We also feel that the maps produced by the Council for consultation purposes are deliberately misleading by not shading out the two largest greenfield development sites (Sites 22-26 and 35-41) in a manner consistent with other sites. This gives the plan an overall "less developed" look. This is clearly intentional and designed to try and mislead the public. Any future maps should consistently represent all development sites.</p> | | | <p>and retain individual character and identity. At the time of consultation in early 2015 there was not sufficient information available as to how development might occur, and which parcels of land would be preferred for development. The ongoing masterplan process is to guide this and will inform the Local Plan Publication , allowing further detail to be made available to all stakeholders, giving chance for further comment and representation. The updated Policies Map will reflect the preferred options for development at both Murton and Killingworth Moor, with the Masterplans providing comprehensive detail.</p> | |
| 638268 | Natural History | | LP20151907 | Site 3: Objection. This site is adjacent to the Annitsford Pond LWS and as | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | Society of Northumbria | | | such development in this area is likely to isolate the site (thus not meeting the requirements of either paragraph 110 to minimise€; adverse effects on the local and natural environment or paragraph 114 plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity. The Seaton Burn runs through this site. Work is being carried out to restore it (as it is failing Water Framework Directive requirements) and to help mitigate flood risks along the burn catchment. Allocating development in this site would not only jeopardise the works already carried out but could also add to flood risk and the adverse impacts that are causing the burn to fail against WFD. We also note the flood risk to the northern edge of this site We believe that it would be inappropriate to develop all of this site and that a significant buffer/wildlife corridor is required between any development and the Pond/burn. This could be easily shown on the map (as we have suggested above). | | Potential Housing Development Sites | ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. This includes whether it is necessary to incorporate a buffer zone to Annitsford Pond into the layout of development. Proposals for development will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and ongoing improvement works to the Seaton Burn. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151908 | Site 5: Objection This site is situated within a wildlife corridor. Development in a wildlife corridor renders the objectives of a wildlife corridor untenable. We believe that it would be inappropriate to develop all of this site and that a buffer/wildlife corridor is | Site 5 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | required to link the wildlife corridor to the west with Killingworth lake to the east. This could be easily shown on the map (as we have suggested above). This would also provide some actual evidence that the LPA is planning positively to create coherent ecological networks and achieve biodiversity gain. | | | order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. This includes whether it is necessary to incorporate a buffer zone to Killingworth Lake into the layout of development. | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151909 | Site 17: Objection An east-west wildlife corridor runs through this site. Development of the whole site would therefore be contrary to NPPF requirement for ecological networks and no biodiversity loss. For this reason we believe that it would be inappropriate to develop all of this site. An east-west wildlife corridor should be retained across the site, ideally linking with one for the adjacent site with planning permission. This could be easily shown on the map (as we have suggested above). This would also provide some actual evidence that the LPA is planning positively to create coherent ecological networks and achieve biodiversity gain. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151910 | <p>Site 22-26: Objection We have concerns over the impacts of development on these sites on the water quality and flooding of the Briardene. Like the Seaton Burn this watercourse was considered failing by the Environment Agency and work is underway to help mitigate for flood risks and water quality. To develop here could result in increased flood risk and a decrease in water quality. We note that there could be areas of semi-improved grassland which may fall under the priority habitats of the Local BAP for neutral grasslands. Development of these would be contrary to paragraph 117 of NPPF to "promote the preservation of, or priority habitats of, or wildlife corridors run through these sites. Whilst we note that this site will be subject to a master plan which will include "new biodiversity" there is no mention of "retaining wildlife corridors" nor does there appear to be any attempt to plan properly for</p> | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render</p> | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>these, for example by specifying more clearly their extent or location (for example in the same way that there is an Indicative Strategic Settlement Buffer. Why not an "Indicative Wildlife Corridor" ?). In particular we note that this area will be crossed by new roads which will significantly negatively effect any wildlife corridor unless provision is made for wildlife crossings, such as raised roads. We believe that with the development, roads and lack of proper planning to achieve coherent ecological network through this site that it fails to meet NPPF requirements. We would like to see initial master planning work carried out on this site to demonstrate that coherent ecological networks and no biodiversity loss can be achieved, prior to inclusion of this site in the Core Strategy.</p> | | | <p>development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. This includes whether it is necessary to incorporate a buffer zone into the layout of development.</p> <p>Proposals for development will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and ongoing improvement works to the Briardene. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151911 | <p>Site 29: Objection This site has been subject to a planning application which was refused and therefore it is unclear why this is still included in the Plan. This site supports a Local Wildlife Site. To develop this site would be contrary to paragraph 110 of NPPF to</p> | Site 29 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The application in question (12/00637/FUL) was refused in May 2015, after the LPCD 2015 was finalised and, indeed, after the close of the consultation exercise.</p> <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Partial</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | "minimise" adverse effects on the local and natural environment€ , to paragraph 114 to "plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity€ and to paragraph 117 of NPPF to "promote the preservation€ or priority habitats€ as this site supports neutral/basic semi improved/unimproved grassland, a BAP habitat. It would also be in contradiction to the Local Plan policy S/8.4c to conserve and enhance€ Local Sites. | | | designation as a LWS does not automatically render development completely inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is apparent that there are still significant obstacles to delivery. However the scheme submitted at the time was deemed acceptable by North Tyneside's biodiversity officer. It is considered that a 65 units scheme, as part of a mixed-use allocation, is still possible for this wider site but deliverability in the short-term is questionable. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151912 | Site 35-41: Objection Firstly, a large proportion of this area is a compensation site for permanent ecological losses from another housing development. To develop it would therefore render the ecological compensation of this previous application untenable. This area should, therefore, not be shown in the development allocations (as we have suggested above). Secondly, parts of this site are being considered by the North Tyneside, Northumbrian Water and the Environment Agency to | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife | A wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>mitigate for flood risks across the borough. Not only would development here mean this needed flood mitigation would not be carried out, but it would also add to flood risk and water quality reductions. Thirdly, wildlife corridors run through these sites. Whilst we note that this site will be subject to a master plan which will include "new biodiversity€ there is no mention of "retaining wildlife corridors" nor does there appear to be any attempt to plan properly for these, for example by specifying more clearly their extent or location (for example in the same way that there is an Indicative Strategic Settlement Buffer. Why not an "Indicative Wildlife Corridor" ?). In particular we note that this area will be crossed by a new road which will significantly negatively effect any wildlife corridor unless provision is made for wildlife crossings, such as raised roads. We believe that with the development, road and lack of proper planning to achieve coherent ecological network through this site that it fails to meet NPPF requirements. We would like to see initial master planning work carried out on this site to demonstrate that the mitigation site will be excluded from the development, that there will be coherent ecological networks and no biodiversity loss can be achieved, prior to inclusion of this site in the Core</p> | | | <p>habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity.</p> <p>Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site.</p> <p>The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Wildlife corridor designation does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---|--------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | Strategy. | | | determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151913 | Site 75: Objection We are concerned that this is an area of woodland that has been allocated for development in an area where other more suitable sites for development are available. To develop here would be contrary to the LPAs own Local Plan policy DM/8.8 to support strategies and proposals that would protect and manage existing woodland. | Site 75 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Comment noted, however it is considered that there is no evidence to support the ecological merit previously identified. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | No amendments proposed. |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151914 | Site 9, now Site E008, 9: Objection We have concerns over the allocation of this site as part of it falls within a Wildlife Corridor and as such would be contrary to paragraph 114 of NPPF to "plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of networks of biodiversity€ . Furthermore, to develop this entire area would not support the aims of the LPAs own policy AS/8.9 for encouraging "improvements to the area for wildlife and recreation€ . For this reason we believe that it would be inappropriate to develop all of this site. | Site 9, now Site E008, 9 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Wildlife corridor designation does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | An east-west wildlife corridor should be retained across the south of the site. This could be easily shown on the map (as we have suggested above). This would also provide some actual evidence that the LPA is planning positively to create coherent ecological networks and achieve biodiversity gain. | | | the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151915 | Site 139: Objection A wildlife corridor runs through this site. Development of the whole site would therefore be contrary to NPPF requirement for ecological networks and no biodiversity loss. For this reason we believe that it would be inappropriate to develop all of this site. A north-south and east-west wildlife corridor should be retained across the site, ideally linking with one for the adjacent site. This could be easily shown on the map (as we have suggested above). This would also provide some actual evidence that the LPA is planning positively to create coherent ecological networks and achieve biodiversity gain. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | A Wildlife corridor policy has been added into the Local Plan. |
| 769763 | Bellway Homes (NE) | DEVELOPER | LP20151924 | Site 35 -41: Bellway has secured an interest in the land identified on the attached plan which is bound by Park Lane, Boundary Mill shopping outlet and A 191 New York Road. The site is capable of accommodating c. 270 units typically family units in a range of sizes and types. The site forms part of the proposed wider allocation identified as | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Comments with regard to the Bellway-owned aspect of the site noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will be undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including landowners | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>'Murton' within Policy AS7.4- Strategic Site Allocations. Bellway fully support the allocation and the proposed release of the site for housing. The site is allocated as Safeguarded land within the saved adopted Local Plan and therefore the principle of housing development in this location is firmly established. Access can be achieved from Park Lane providing direct access into Bellway's site and could be designed to provide a connection into the wider allocation. A secondary emergency access could also be achieved from New York Road. Bellway's land interest is capable of coming forward in the short term (0-5 year period) and would meet the deliverable tests set out in the NPPF as there are no known impediments to its delivery. Recognising the importance of the comprehensive delivery of the wider proposed allocation, Bellway are committed to ensuring the development of their landholding would not prejudice the implementation of the wider site in accordance with criteria b) of the Policy. However, Bellway's site could come forward independently and be accessed directly from Park Lane with connections provided to the site boundary to comprehensively connect and integrate with to the wider allocation. Finally, the delivery of Bellway's land interest provides a</p> | | | <p>and statutory bodies, including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date. Such an approach will avoid any risk of piecemeal development. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The most appropriate means of access, to this particular parcel and the wider development, will be a crucial aspect of this work. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> | <p>facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | logical extension to the existing built up area and would not lead to the coalescence of any settlements including Shiremoor with Murton. | | | | |
| 769763 | Bellway Homes (NE) | DEVELOPER | LP20151925 | <p>Site 22-26: Bellway owns land in the central element of the Killingworth Moor allocation as delineated on the attached plan. Bellway obtained full planning permission on 23 January 2015 for the redevelopment of the former REME Depot, Killingworth Village (the land identified in red on the plan) to provide 125 dwellings with access from the 81317 West Lane (LPA ref: 14/00730/FUL) ("the REME site"). Construction of the site has begun and it is anticipated that the development will complete in 2018. Bellway also own the land immediately surrounding the REME site (shown within the blue line on the plan and hereafter referred to as "the extension land"). This land provides a logical extension to the REME site and has potential to provide a further 180 units which would be fully deliverable in the short term (i.e. in parallel with and following on from the completion of the REME site). The ownership forms part of the proposed allocation identified as 'Murton' within Policy AS7.4- Strategic Site Allocations. Bellway fully support the allocation. The ownership is within an area allocated as Safeguarded land within the saved adopted Local Plan and</p> | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Comments with regard to the Bellway-owned aspect of the site noted. As highlighted, a comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This is being undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including landowners and statutory bodies, including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The most appropriate means of access, to this particular parcel and the wider development, will be a crucial aspect of this work.</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | therefore the principle of housing development in this location is already firmly established. Whilst the finer details of the comprehensive master plan for the allocation will be refined in due course informed by the technical work still to be undertaken we support the principle and logic of a western access through the approved REME site to facilitate the development of the extension land and wider allocation beyond. The through road approved for the REME site has been designed to cater for additional capacity and to allow for bus penetration to serve the extension land and the wider land as required. Also the junction at the entrance to the REME site on West Lane can be upgraded to a roundabout to increase capacity. Delivery of the REME site and early delivery of the extension land would not prejudice the implementation of the wider allocation and indeed could assist in facilitating its development in accordance with criteria b) of Policy AS7.4. | | | | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151942 | Natural England note that the potential housing development sites in Whitley Bay have been screened in for Appropriate Assessment (AA), however the potential for cumulative impacts as a result of recreational disturbance from housing beyond the Coastal Zone on Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar have not been considered. Natural England is particularly concerned that | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with Natural England in order to deliver development over the plan period which is sustainable and which avoids any adverse impact on environmental sites, including areas covered by SPA and Ramsar designations. This will include undertaking further work through the SA and HRA processes as necessary. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>large allocations such as sites 35-41 at Murton are collectively stated to provide a maximum of 3,000 dwellings. Although further away from the Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar than the development sites in Whitley Bay, the number of dwellings proposed is far greater and so recreational disturbance should be considered here in particular. If it has been determined that sites beyond the Coastal Zone are unlikely to significantly affect the Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar, this should be justified. 16. When undertaking your Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), allocations that are likely to contribute to increased recreational activities should be reassessed, taking into account potential impacts from recreational disturbance both alone and in combination. Unless an allocation is large and in close proximity to the site, recreational disturbance is often a cumulative/in combination effect that occurs as a result of a planar€™s housing distribution. As the location of an allocation is not the primary determinant of whether new residents will visit and affect the SPA/Ramsar (accessibility and attractiveness are key determinants), this assessment would be more effective when considered against overall housing numbers and their strategic distribution. This would avoid a complex in combination</p> | | | | <p>development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | <p>assessment of individual allocations.</p> <p>17. When determining likely significant effects or adverse effects on integrity, the HRA should consider the in combination effects of policies that increase housing in proximity to the coast and promote the coast as a visitor destination. This assessment should consider whether the mitigation measures within policy DM.8 are sufficient to avoid the combined effects of more housing and an attractive and accessible coast.</p> <p>18. Natural England notes that the assessment of the development sites 35-41 at Murton listed in the local plan are absent from the SA and HRA. However the SA refers to two sites at Murton (116 "" Murton North and 117 "" Murton South) with Murton North and Murton South also the names used in the HRA. It is unclear to Natural England whether sites 35-41 and 116-117 cover the same land. If this is the case then the numbering system used should be consistent for clarity. If this is not the case then given their importance of Murton in delivering the housing development site numbers these should be assessed in the SA and HRA in line with all other development sites.</p> | | | | |
| 805556 | | | LP20151973 | Site 22 - 26: I raised a number of comments at the earlier consultation stage, primarily focusing on the following concerns in respect of sites | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>located in and around Killingworth: - Potential for substantial congestion in an area already subject to significant road usage / delays. Many people living in this area travel towards Newcastle and not along the A19 corridor, there is only one road on which to do this, which is already heavily congested especially during rush hour. - Potential for excessive demands for school places, in an area that is already heavily over-subscribed. - Potential for the loss of significant green space. - Potential for the loss of identity, amalgamating Killingworth with surrounding areas, generating a continuous urban sprawl that stretches to the coast.</p> | | Development Sites | <p>development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable.</p> <p>The importance of community services, including schools, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs.</p> | <p>of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| 830576 | Taylor Wimpey | DEVELOPER | LP20151983 | <p>Site 139: These representations are made on behalf of Taylor Wimpey North East in response to the ongoing consultation on the North Tyneside Local Plan. These representations have been prepared having regard to Taylor Wimpey's land interest within the borough, specifically including proposed housing allocation site 139 (land at Darsley Park), under policy S7.3 (distribution of potential housing development sites). As a general observation, Taylor Wimpey North East is a member of the Home Builders Federation (HBF) and supports the representations made by the HBF, addressing matters of borough wide significance. Further observations in relation to the plan are set out below. Policy S7.3 identifies the sites which the Council proposes to allocate for residential development over the plan period. These representations do not comment on each individual site. although support the allocation of land at Darsley Park (map reference 139) for the development of approximately 98 residential dwellings. Taylor Wimpey North East has previously promoted this site through the most recent SHLAA consultation and provided evidence to demonstrate its deliverability. In this respect, pre-application discussions within North Tyneside Council have commenced, with the Council confirming a general</p> | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Support for development noted. Site 139 is identified as a suggested allocation for residential development through the Local Plan process. This follows a positive assessment of suitability and availability in the SHLAA, with site concluded to be deliverable in the next 5 years following consideration of the evidence. However, a proposal for development will still have to address any identified constraints, which will have to be assessed, and where necessary mitigated, on a site-specific basis through the development management process.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | in principle acceptance of the proposed development, subject to receiving a formal planning application. In terms of site deliverability (referring to footnote 11 of the NPPF) the site is available for development. and represents a suitable location for development now (as confirmed by the SHLAA). Subject to the submission of a formal planning application, survey work undertaken by Taylor Wimpey and progress made on pre-application discussions with the Council, there is a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on this site within 5 years. In this respect. it is also demonstrated that the site is viable and dependable. with a developer commitment to promote a short term planning application. | | | | |
| 900788 | | DEVELOPER | LP20151992 | New Site - Land at Wallsend Road (currently a suggested employment site): Our client objects to this policy as there are insufficient sites identified on the Policies Map to meet the objectively assessed housing needs in North Tyneside. In order to meet this objectively assessed housing need (as set out in the HEaDROOM Report) our client's site at Wallsend Road should be included as a housing allocation. In addition, Policy S7.3 currently identifies no preferred sites for housing development in the Percy Main area. Housing development at our client's site will ensure that a | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now AS4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>sufficient supply of new homes is provided in the Percy Main area over the plan period, which makes a positive contribution to the area, whilst contributing towards the delivery of the Spatial Strategy. As such, it is considered that our client's site at Wallsend Road should be allocated for housing development.</p> <p>Site Overview The site is located to the north of the identified Local Centre of Percy Main and comprises a vacant open field which extends to 1.6ha (approx.). A footpath intersects the site to the south which runs along the eastern boundary of the site and also joins Wallsend Road to the west. The site is bounded as follows: "ç To the north by Wallsend Road and A193, beyond which lies an open field and the Tyne Tunnel Trading Estate; "ç To the east by a disused wagon way and a pedestrian footpath, beyond which lies the Percy Main residential area; "ç To the west by Wallsend Road and a timber yard (John Potts Ltd), beyond which lies a scrap yard; and "ç To the south by hedgerows and vegetation, beyond which lies the Percy Main residential area. The site benefits from an existing access off Wallsend Road and is within close proximity to a range of bus stops and the Percy Main Metro Station. Policy Context The site is currently allocated in the LPCD as an employment site (Policy S5.2), which</p> | | | <p>analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. Site NT006 is included for assessment in the SHLAA (Site 061). However, it is considered that the site is currently unsuitable for housing development, reflecting locational factors and site constraints, therefore it has not been considered as a potential housing allocation through the Local Plan process. On consideration of a range of evidence, expert advice and comments received through the consultation process, it has been determined that it would be best to be retain as employment land, meeting the economic growth and development needs of the borough over the plan period. The Council encourages the landowner and agent to continue to engage positively through the consultation process. This includes providing any further evidence/detail which could assist in the SHLAA assessment.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>falls within the A 19 (T) Economic Corridor designation. In addition, the site is bordered to the east by a Transport Safeguarding Route (Policy S10.3) beyond which lies a Wildlife Corridor (Policy S8.4). Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) The site forms part of a wider site in the SHLAA (Ref No. 061), which is identified as being not presently developable. The site is identified as having housing potential, with no identified technical issues or constraints. The only reason the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development is its allocation as an employment site. Noise I Residential Amenity Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Planning. Design. Economics. The site lies adjacent to commercial uses to the west, which comprise a timber yard (John Potts Ltd) and beyond this a scrap yard. Appropriate mitigation could be provided along the western boundary such as buffering strips, landscaping bunds or acoustic fencing. Consideration will also be given to the appropriate siting and specification of new homes. Such mitigation will protect the amenity of new residents from noise generated from the neighbouring uses and prevent limitations on the neighbouring employment uses. Site Suitability "ç An existing access is available off Wallsend</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Road; "ç The site lies in Flood Zone 1 and is not at risk of flooding; "ç The site does not form part of any wildlife or ecology designations. A Wildlife Corridor passes the site to the east and landscape buffering could be provided to supplement this designation; "ç We are not aware of any contamination issues at the site and consider that, given its greenfield status, there are unlikely to be any such issues; and "ç The site currently comprises poor quality grassland and could be brought forward for residential development to bring regeneration benefits to the Percy Main area. Sustainability The site represents a sustainable and logical infill, relating well to the existing built form of the Percy Main area. The site is located within close proximity of a range of local services and facilities, including: a Doctors Surgery (within 100m), a Food & Wine Shop (within 200m), a Mini Market (within 250m), St. John's C of E Church (within 300m), Percy Main Football & Cricket Club (within 400m), and Percy Main Primary School (within 450m). The site also benefits from excellent public transport links including four bus stops and Percy Main Metro Station within 250m. In the context of the above, it is considered that the site is located in a highly sustainable location.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site is suitable, available and achievable with no</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>technical constraints. The residential development of the site would help to achieve the Council's housing requirements. Economic Impacts An economic assessment of the proposals demonstrates that the proposed development at our client's site at will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "ç Create 60 person-years of employment in construction - equivalent to supporting an average of 30 jobs throughout the entire duration of the anticipated 24 month build programme; "ç Support a further 45 jobs in the supply chain and related services and deliver an additional Â£700,000 of GVA (economic output) per annum during the construction period; "ç Attract new (predominantly economically active) households to live in the area, resulting in Â£370,000 of net additional expenditure in shops and services within North Tyneside. This additional expenditure could support the creation of approximately 5 new FTE jobs in the local area (including opportunities in the retail and leisure sectors); "ç Result in a further Â£270,000 of first occupation expenditure on goods and services to make a house 'feel like home' a proportion of which would be captured locally; Generate New Homes Bonus payments of approximately Â£400,000 in total; "ç An uplift in Council Tax revenues of more than Â£60,000 per annum <p>Potential Development The site</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | could accommodate a development of approximately 50 homes. Options include the provision of market and affordable homes for local families to meet the Council's housing requirements and the needs identified in the SHMA. The site is available for development immediately and can be brought forward for development as soon as planning permission is granted. The landowner is supportive of development and strong house builder interest has been confirmed. In the context of the above, our Client respectfully requests that the Council re-allocate the site at Wallsend Road from employment uses and remove the site from the A 19 (T) Economic Corridor to facilitate its inclusion as a housing allocation in the next iteration of the LPCD. | | | | |
| 900817 | | RESIDENT | LP20151997 | Site 35 - 41: Please accept the following in your consideration of the next steps of the North Tyneside 2015 Local Plan, in particular in respect to the proposed master plan/building/transport work on and around plots 35-41 around Shiremoor and Murton Village. In any case, I have now had a chance to look at the local plan and policies map/previous local feedback. I am pleased to see that Murton Village has been granted some protection in the revised plan and that the proposed maximum housing numbers have been decreased from | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>5000 to 3000 on the site in question. (Plots 35-41) However, I do now have concerns that this may push a lot of the building work even closer to the existing Shiremoor estates (and therefore my own home). It does seem unfair that there has been no area of protection on the West side of the site for Shiremoor too, especially as that means that the open space and semi-rural identity of Shiremoor which I purchased my home here for, could be completely wiped out and replaced by the excessive noise, traffic and pollution of a major transport route. I'm devastated at the prospect of this. The vast majority of Shiremoor residents do not have immediate access to the small area of greenbelt land north of the metro line, a lot of which are allotments rather than open spaces anyway. Should plans go ahead, there will no longer be any moor in Shiremoor, one of only 3 or 4 dedicated moors around Newcastle, and that really would be a tragic loss. Having said all this, I am aware that the land in question is already owned by a housing developer, so I am not naive enough to think that building can be stopped altogether, after all, Persimmon will want to see a profit and yourselves at the Council have housing targets to meet, so my priority is to make suggestions which will minimise disruption/destruction of my</p> | | | <p>significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. This includes the careful consideration of the most appropriate means of access from the existing network. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> <p>Importantly, the impact which the proposed new link road will have upon the Green Belt will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process.</p> <p>In addition to this, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes working with Nexus and public transport providers in</p> | <p>detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>little part of the community. My biggest objection is to the proposed dual carriageway right up the centre of the site. It not only completely crosses a very important wildlife corridor but is also proposed to go straight through into Greenbelt land at it's north end. Horrendously inconsiderate and environmentally insensitive planning. One of the main reasons I purchased a house here was because of the open green spaces and wildlife within such a well-linked and facilitated area. Even with the extra proposed housing and related facilities, a dual carriageway would be a completely unnecessary invasion through the site. I appreciate that there will be hope for employment links between the new estate(s) and the industrial/economic corridor to the south plus Silverlink, but it would still be massive overkill! And why create such a massive road to join up to the tiny protected villages of Earsdon and South Wellfield? Are we expecting a sudden population explosion? There's no need. Not only does the proposed road start off (next to site 107 on the map) almost right next to the A19 and A191 corridor which also edges the site, but there are already plenty of links up to the main junction of the A192 and A186 at Earsdon, major and minor. For example, even the regular width street of Park Lane is hardly bumper-to-</p> | | | <p>order to identify need for new services and public transport links. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>bumper slow-moving traffic at 5pm on a weekday. Yes, the proposed housing will need it's own main road to service it, but it won't be creating a dramatic increase in traffic travelling northwards, as the main region's employment zones, city and coast can all be reached via the south edge of the site. I also worry that by creating more major links to the north, we could actually inadvertently overload areas like the Silverlink even more rather than encouraging traffic away from it. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan/Travel Plan needs some serious reconsideration regarding this proposed 'protected' route. If built, it will fragment the Shiremoor/West Allotment areas even further - there are so many major roads through this area already. And why should this route be protected but the existing wildlife corridor and greenbelt land it proposed to go through isn't?</p> <p>Returning to the site in question and proposed building of houses/facilities, I have some concerns relating to the promise to "prevent joining of existing communities" versus the requirement of residents in my immediate area (the estate along the Angerton Avenue to Glendale Road edge of the site) for some safe, green open space. As you know, this area is skirted by a public right of way, which finishes directly next to my house on Angerton Avenue</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>via the back of Boundary Mill Stores. At the moment, this route isn't a particularly obvious fenced off one, and we residents are concerned that if new building work is done right up to the site boundary, it will become one, which could attract loiterers and break-in/drug related crime (as the walkways around Shiremoor metro are), especially if it is linked up to any of the new housing estates or major public transport sites/ schools / supermarket facilities in particular and so becomes a cut through for the public. House values are around a third higher on and around Angerton Avenue because it is slightly separated and buffered from the rest of Shiremoor, so experiences much less crime, and is quieter when it comes to through traffic. This is also due to the number of homes which back on to the green open spaces of this site, with sea views visible down the side of Boundary Mill. There are a lot of dog-walkers around this estate who make use of this open space, it is filled with wildlife which is welcomed by the residents - you only have to look at all the homes with bird baths/boxes in the trees and food left out for hedgehogs etc to see this. Wildlife in gardens on this estate/the fields this side of the proposed dual carriageway includes a huge variety of visiting and nesting birds, hedgehogs, frogs, rabbits and</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>foxes (which with even more housing could suddenly be branded pests rather than a perfectly welcome aspect of the area) - all of which I saw personally within just a couple of weeks of moving. Building right up to our site edge and going through with the proposed road will cut us off completely from the supposedly protected wildlife corridor, which would be extremely environmentally destructive. The Police service also use the public right of way and fields backing on to our little estate as a training and exercise route for police horses, so the area directly adjacent (Please see highlighted yellow area in the attached picture) really is an important area of land to preserve if we can get it protected somehow. This would also serve to un-wall the public right of way and make it a less obviously not-overlooked route for potential criminal activity (other than one burglary on the Boundary Mill Store site last year, there are no records of break-ins via this walkway at all over the last couple of years at least), and keep it safe for homeowners such as myself, walkers and people exercising their dogs (many of whom are middle-aged or vulnerable older lone females or elderly couples). Not being overly closed off or a cut through for other streets and facilities, this land is</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>currently a very safe open space for residents. I expect that keeping this little section of land and not joining it to any new estates would also keep the homeowners of the west-facing open-aspect bungalows happy as their properties still have open green space to the rear. Protecting this area also helps towards the promise to preserve distinction between areas - although to be honest, I think only by leaving the whole of the section of the site to the East of the proposed dual carriageway would truly do that and keep the wildlife corridor safely intact. Actually, that would probably keep almost all of the Shiremoor residents happy! I think it would also be very important to ensure that the opening to the site between Angerton Avenue and Alwinton Road is kept as pedestrian-only access for this reason, as well as to prevent the estate being used as a through route. I can see that the end of Glendale Rd has the potential to be continued to the north, so I again request that this stays separate from and is not joined up to any major roads to the north and east - I live opposite to the junction of Angerton Avenue and Horsley Avenue, and there are already a fair few cars and vans using it as a cut through to avoid part of Park Lane. Joining the estate to another at Glendale Road could dramatically increase through traffic, and it would</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | become very noisy and a major annoyance as headlights from turning cars point directly into my living room and main bedroom. Again, crime increase would be a concern to me too. I was also informed by another resident that the section of land at the end of Glendale Rd could not be built on after the installation of flooding prevention devices as everything would sink - I'm not sure of the details of this but it is worth researching if you haven't already. I sincerely hope that you will take my views and feedback into consideration, if you look back at the online forum feedback from the last stage of the public consultation, you will see that there was actually more objection to building next to the existing homes in Shiremoor than there was around Murton village, and that has been granted a protected zone around it. | | | | |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151998 | Site 22 - 26: These representations have been prepared by Bilfinger GVA on behalf of the Northumberland Estates and jointly with the Banks Group ("the Consortium"), who are principle landowners and controlling landowners at Killingworth Moor. 1.2 The representations respond to the North Tyneside Local Plan Consultation February 2015 ("the Local Plan"). 1.3 North Tyneside Council ("the Council") will be aware that the consortium has the majority land | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for allocation of Killingworth Moor noted. Details of likely delivery rates are also noted as are the example benefits which will be brought to this development and to the wider community. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This is being undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including landowners and statutory | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>interest in the land at Killingworth Moor, currently identified as a Strategic Land Allocation in the Local Plan under Policy AS7.4. The Council will be aware that both landowners have secured planning permission for development on land in the immediate surrounding area including at Shiremoor, Northumberland Park and Great Lime Road in delivering new housing, education, retail and leisure and new metro station. The consortium also have land interests in Northumberland and Newcastle and are therefore not only experienced in delivering significant new development but have extensive knowledge of the local context and the planning policy position in North Tyneside and also within neighbouring authorities including Northumberland and Newcastle. 1.4 These representations relate specifically to the land at Killingworth Moor (outlined in red on the plan in Appendix 1) and are without prejudice to any other representations submitted by either member of the consortium regarding other land interests within North Tyneside or any adjoining authority. 1.5 These representations are provided within the context of paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") which states: "The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to</p> | | | <p>consultees, and will build on the work carried out to date. The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now AS4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. the strategic allocations policy sets out the intended delivery of a maximum of 4,500 homes between the two strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton, with the exact proportion on each to be determined after further analysis, particularly through the masterplanning process. This will consider whether the option to increase delivery above the 1,700 currently set out in LPCD 2015.</p> | <p>exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is "sound" "" namely that it is: Positively prepared "" the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development; i. Justified "" the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; i. Effective "" the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and i. Consistent with national policy "" the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework." The Consortium supports the allocation of land at Killingworth Moor within policies S7.3 and AS7.4. The Local Plan highlights the long term nature of both Strategic Sites which will make a vital contribution to housing delivery in this plan period and beyond. In S7.3 it</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>suggests that a total of 4,500 out of 5,000 houses from the two sites would be delivered in the plan period. It is stated, in paragraph 7.36 of the Local Plan, that neither Killingworth nor Murton is likely to be completed by 2032. However, it is worth noting that the proposed allocation sites identified in S7.3 fall short of meeting the full OAN to 2032 so if there is scope to enhance delivery from the two strategic sites during the plan period this would be highly beneficial to the delivery of new housing and the objectives of the Local Plan. Assuming adoption of the Local Plan in 2016 and both strategic sites start delivering housing in year 2017 and reach optimum build out rates the following year in 2018, Killingworth Moor (if it were to be allocated for 1,700 units as currently propose) would need to be built out at a rate of about 120 per annum to be completed in 2032 and Murton (if it were allocated for 2,800 units as currently proposed) would need to be built out at a rate of about 200 per year. As a general rule of thumb any one house builder will expect to build and sell up to 50 units per annum from an outlet. On this basis the Murton strategic site would require 4 builders throughout the plan period. Killingworth Moor would need 2-3 builders over the same period. The consortium suggests that there is</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | scope for an increase in the delivery from Killingworth Moor during the plan period from 1,700 to 2,100. This enhanced delivery would assume three builders on site which appears very realistic given that there are discreet parts of the site which could be marketed quite differently. This takes into account the extant permission for the REME Depot which to some extent would allow the Killingworth Moor area to establish itself earlier in the plan period than 2017. There is clear evidence that both Strategic Site Allocations are needed during this Local Plan period based on both the current OAN and on the OAN the consortium suggest against Policy AS7.1 (now S4.1). Both are long term strategic sites which should be planned strategically from the outset to realise the greatest benefits to the future residents and wider community. The Local Plan process provides the best chance of starting this process. At Killingworth Moor there are a number of opportunities for major benefits when planning at this scale. These include public transport, public access and connectivity, education provision, community facilities, wildlife habitat, green infrastructure, flood mitigation and low carbon energy. | | | | |
| 901015 | | RESIDENT | LP20152024 | Site 17 - Station Road Wallsend I am writing to register my deep concern regarding the proposed building on | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>current green fields between Benton, Wallsend & Palmersville. Since I moved into this area 8 years ago the amount of building that has taken place has been quite extraordinary. This, together with the resultant loss of green space, the increase in traffic and the lack of appropriate infrastructure already struggling to cope with existing demands, means that the whole area is changing "" in my opinion "" for worse not for better. If you believe the current resident's opinions and wishes mean anything "; please do everything you can to stop this impingement on green field areas.</p> | | Housing Development Sites | <p>Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme</p> | <p>indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | |
| 901015 | | RESIDENT | LP20152025 | Site 11 now Site E0101 - East Benton Farm Objection I am writing to register my deep concern regarding the proposed building on current green fields between Benton, Wallsend & Palmersville. Since I moved into this area 8 years ago the amount of building that has taken place has been quite extraordinary. This, together with the resultant loss of green space, the increase in traffic and the lack of appropriate infrastructure already struggling to cope with existing demands, means that the whole area is changing "" in my opinion "" for worse not for better. If you believe the current resident's opinions and wishes mean anything "; please do everything you can to stop this impingement on green field areas. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | |
| 901015 | | RESIDENT | LP20152026 | Site 139: Darsley Park - Objection I am writing to you register my deep concern regarding the proposed building on current green fields between Benton, Wallsend & Palmersville. Since I moved into this area 8 years ago the amount of building that has taken place has been quite extraordinary. This, together with the resultant loss of green space, the increase in traffic and the lack of appropriate infrastructure already struggling to cope with existing demands, means that the whole area is changing "" in my opinion "" for worse not for better. If you believe the current resident's opinions and wishes mean anything "; please do everything you can to stop this impingement on green field areas. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> | |
| 901015 | | RESIDENT | LP20152027 | Site 22 to 26 - Killingworth Moor I am writing to you to register my deep concern regarding the proposed building on current green fields between Benton, Wallsend & Palmersville. Since I moved into this area 8 years ago the amount of building that has taken place has been quite extraordinary. This, together with the resultant loss of green space, the increase in traffic and the lack of appropriate infrastructure already struggling to cope with existing demands, means that the whole area is changing "" in my opinion "" for worse | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | not for better. If you believe the current resident's opinions and wishes mean anything "; please do everything you can to stop this impingement on green field areas. | | | networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. | detailed masterplanning. |
| 805823 | | | LP20152031 | Site 17: Station Road, Wallsend - Objection We want to add to the objections from Benton residents about the proposed developments along the A191 (plots 17,111 and 139). Given that there is already planning permission for a large housing development at the top of the A186, further housing development in that | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>immediate area will greatly affect the neighbourhood. It will add substantially to the traffic congestion on the A191, and remove green space and access corridors for wildlife. The Rising Sun Country Park, as the only remaining local leisure space, will become overloaded and further degraded. We are very pleased that the proposal to build on the triangle of land behind Midhurst Road has been taken out of this latest version of the plan.</p> | | | <p>wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> | |
| 805823 | | | LP20152033 | <p>Site 11 now Site E0101: East Benton Farm, Objection We want to add to the objections from Benton residents about the proposed developments along the A191 (plots 17,111 and 139). Given that there is already planning permission for a large housing development at the top of the A186, further housing development in that immediate area will greatly affect the neighbourhood. It will add substantially to the traffic congestion on the A191, and remove green space</p> | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | and access corridors for wildlife. The Rising Sun Country Park, as the only remaining local leisure space, will become overloaded and further degraded. We are very pleased that the proposal to build on the triangle of land behind Midhurst Road has been taken out of this latest version of the plan. | | | improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | |
| 805823 | | | LP20152035 | Site 139 Darsley Park, Objection We want to add to the objections from Benton residents about the proposed developments along the A191 (plots 17,111 and 139). Given that there is already planning permission for a large housing development at the top of the A186, further housing development in that immediate area will greatly affect the neighbourhood. It will add substantially to the traffic congestion on the A191, and remove green space and access corridors for wildlife. The Rising Sun Country Park, as the only remaining local leisure space, will become overloaded and further degraded. We are very pleased that | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | the proposal to build on the triangle of land behind Midhurst Road has been taken out of this latest version of the plan. | | | and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | |
| 805823 | | | LP20152036 | Removal of site at Midhurst Road, Support We are very pleased that the proposal to build on the triangle of land behind Midhurst Road has been taken out of this latest version of the plan. | Site 14 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | No amendments proposed. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152037 | Site 22 -26: Generally supportive Policy S7.3 highlights and allocated selected development sites for housing use for a total number of 8806 as confirmed by the latest SHLAA. While commendable to include this level of information as confirmed by table 8 on page 87 there is a total remaining need for the plan period of 10189 units as such there is a remaining un identified total of houses of 1383 units across the plan period. Not withstanding the overall deliverability of all sites which | Windfall | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for allocation of Killingworth Moor noted. Details of likely delivery rates are also noted as are the example benefits which will be brought to this development and to the wider community. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This is being undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including landowners and statutory bodies, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>we question given the high number of Brown Field developments this leaves approximately 8% of the total requirements to be met through windfall allowance which is considered excessive and not conducive with a positively plan lead approach. While we don't disagree that some units will be delivered via windfall sites, historic windfall allowances cannot be attributed based on past trends given that the authority have been planning via the appeal process on "windfall sites" since 2011 and that this is the predominant base of its 5 year land supply (as shown on page 87). In addition to the above, Persimmon have been involved during the SHLAA preparation process and know that this document is a very robust and comprehensive assessment of land available / likely available during the lifetime of the plan. Given the robust nature of this and that Windfall sites are any sites not identified during the Plan preparation process we question the reliance on such a large percent of windfall can be justified. Persimmon suggest that existing development sites currently identified and some sites in the SHLAA not currently identified for development within the plan period could be brought forward to meet this need. Further details on this can be found in the last section of this representation. The above being said</p> | | | <p>including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date. The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. As noted, in addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now AS4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA and further work will be undertaken in order to ensure the robustness of the data which supports the windfall forecast. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. However the need to refine the preferred allocations will be considered for the next of the plan.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|---|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | however the overall spatial portrait and strategy of distribution of sites seems reasonable and sustainable. | | | | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152058 | Site 17 - Station Road South West: Sites 17 and 18 (71 and 72 on the Policy Map) are considered to be logical development sites for housing development and are currently being progressed in part through the application process. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for allocation noted. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152059 | Site 11 now Site E0101: Station Road South West: Sites 17 and 18 (71 and 72 on the Policy Map) are considered to be logical development sites for housing development and are currently being progressed in part through the application process. Furthermore there is a logical additional parcel to the south of site 18 which is under Persimmon Homes ownership and could represent a "phase 3" of a wider development. The site is included in the SHLAA as site no. 73 and is considered capable of delivering units within the plan period. As such it is considered that the site should be included in the Policy Map as a potential housing development site. This would further reduce the non allocated housing number and over reliance on windfall delivery in line with the NPPF and sustainable plan led development. | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for allocation noted. Site 11 now Site E0101 (SHLAA 073) is included as a suggested site for allocation in the Local Plan, being identified for potential development for 50 dwellings as part of the wider Station Road developments (both permitted and proposed). Therefore, the site is included on the current of the Policies Map as a suggested residential allocation. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152060 | Site 35 - 41: Murton: The parcels of land to the south of Murton village and North West are considered to | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | Support for allocation at Murton noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>represent a viable opportunity for a large-scale sustainable development within North Tyneside. It is considered that this should be progressed through the Local Plan and the area designated as a strategic development site.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes have attended meeting and are progressing master planning works with other interested land owners in this area to assist and support the allocation of the wider area for up to 3000 units. Due to the potential scale of the development area at Murton a holistic approach needs to be taken to ensure that there is sufficient space for essential amenities such as public open space. In addition a certain level of mitigation land may be required to address some of the impacts associated with development. Strategic planning of this area will ensure that development can be brought forward successfully through a collaborative approach in order for Murton to positively contribute to the delivery of the NTLPCD 2015. A separate submission on behalf of the Murton Development Consortium has been made to which we are a part. Please read both of these submissions together as one full representation to this consultation .</p> <p>The current stage of the NTLPCD 2015 represents an opportunity to plan strategically to ensure that this sustainable development area is</p> | | Housing Development Sites | <p>prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. his will be undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including landowners and statutory bodies, including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date.</p> | <p>sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | brought forward in a joined-up logical manner, avoiding piecemeal and incidental development. We would like to thank North Tyneside for this opportunity to comment on their emerging plan and would ask to be kept informed of any further and future development as part of the consultation for the emerging plan. | | | | |
| 901149 | | RESIDENT | LP20152067 | Site 22 - 26: I understand the Local Authority's need for a local plan. Central government's proposals on planning and enthusiastic developers have reduced the ability of local people to influence the area in which we live. The development of such a large area of land on Killingworth Moor is a contentious issue. It is my view that the proposed plan does not provide sufficient protection to the Killingworth Village conservation area. The main concern is the road infrastructure proposal; in particular the link between the site and the B1317. This road is unsuitable for the increased volume of traffic from such a development. Another area of concern is the strain on existing amenities i.e.: schools, doctors surgeries etc and the lack of public transport. Given the distance between Murton and Killingworth how can joint facilities be workable? The authority's said a masterplan would be required for the area (sites 22-26). Not much detail on how this would be formulated is given | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. Central to this is the need to protect the setting of Killingworth Village Conservation Area. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|--|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>in the plan. This puts residents in the position of commenting on a plan with limited detail and a wish list of proposals. It is easy to be sceptical of the Local Authority's plans. The junction at Palmersville has been constructed leading to Killingworth Moor complete with traffic lights. This, together with the size of the roads proposed on the REME Development leading to the Moor, gives the impression the development was always going to take place. It is my opinion that no further access to the Moor should be granted through the REME Development onto the B1317. Access to the site via the A19/Holystone should be considered. A high priority should be the formulation of an amenities strategy to include: schools, surgeries, footpaths and public transport routes. It is important local people have equal input into any development of a masterplan for this site. The developers will be lobbying hard to ensure they get their way and maximise the amount of land released for housing. The masterplan should not be written by the developers and any future proposals for the site should be resisted until a masterplan is agreed.</p> | | | <p>delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. The impact on the B1317 will be of key concern, with the objective on minimising additional flows on the existing highway network. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable.</p> <p>In addition, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. The importance of community services, including schools and GPs, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. The option for the provision of joint services between the two strategic sites will be explored together with providers and key stakeholders in order to deliver the most effective results for both new and existing communities and the wider population.</p> | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152076 | New Site: Russell Square Policy S7.3 outlines the preferred locations for | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of | The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on | The sites allocated for housing development |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>housing development that, along with the two Strategic Sites, are to come forward to meet the housing requirement of 10,189 over the plan period. Although the total capacity of preferred housing locations and Strategic Sites exceed this requirement, our client considers that the housing requirement is too low and should be increased. It is also important to note that, as shown in Table 8, a significant proportion of housing delivery is dependent on all existing planning permissions being implemented. Our client considers that it is unlikely that all sites with planning permission or minded to grant permission will be fully developed. As such, it is likely that the outstanding housing requirement will be greater than currently identified. In consideration of the above, our client questions whether the current supply identified through preferred housing locations and Strategic Sites will be sufficient to meet the housing requirement and that greater flexibility should be afforded. It is therefore considered that further sites for housing should be allocated. In addition, Policy S7.3 currently only identifies two preferred sites for housing development in Seaton Burn. These sites are "Drift Inn' (Ref 133) and "Site of former Seaton Burn First School' (Ref 141), with an anticipated</p> | | Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now AS4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 148). The SHLAA currently concludes that this site is unsuitable for residential development. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period.</p> | <p>through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | yield of 8 and 6 dwellings respectively. It is clear that the combined yield of these sites will not be sufficient to meet the future housing needs of Seaton Burn over the plan period and that further sites in the settlement will be required to come forward. The allocation of our client's site for housing will contribute towards the delivery of a sufficient supply of new homes in Seaton Burn. Our client's site is deliverable in the short term and would make a positive contribution to Seaton Burn, whilst contributing towards the delivery of the Spatial Strategy. As such, it is considered that our client's site should be allocated for housing development. | | | | |
| 396238 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20152082 | Site 3: Support the continuation of House building on the Annitsford Farm site and ask that in the Planning Brief special consideration be given to the needs of the residents in the existing streets of Hedgefield View, Ford View which face the site and North Villas. I do not consider access to Annitsford Farm site is possible via existing space between Ford View and shops i.e. across Car park of Clayton Arms. Only possibility if compulsory purchase of land and demolition of Public House. Could be possible if new Public House was offered as part of new housing development. | Site 3 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for housing, and the use of a Planning Brief to guide development, noted. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. For Annitsford Fm, this includes important consideration and resolution of access constraints and measures to address capacity in the local highway network. The importance of community services and | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | facilities, including replacement of any existing facilities lost through development/construction, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will enable delivery of required infrastructure to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 396238 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20152083 | New Site: Dudley - Small piece of unused land between rear of 20 and 21 East View Terrace, and 48 Bamborough Court suitable for infill site for 2/3 houses | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Suggestion noted. The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. Only sites with an indicative capacity of 5 dwellings or more have been considered for allocation through the Local Plan. However, in addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now AS4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Sites such as that suggested in Dudley will go towards meeting this total. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 396238 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20152085 | New Site: Seaton Burn - Most people in the village take a great interest in what is happening in their community and over the years ward Councillors have discussed issues about structural changes in the area in an open and constructive way. Whilst we have not held formal meetings to judge | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>response to proposed local plan we have gathered considerable feed back through talking to residents in informal settings and on their behalf would like consideration to be given to the following: 1. The Fewster's site of shops and caravan parking in the centre of the village is in an important strategic location. It has residential properties to the south (Jubilee Terrace and Bridge Street), east (Russell Square), north (where the new Chapelville Sheltered Home is nearing construction and 6 bungalows are planned), and part of the coast to coast cycle way to the west. Current applications for change of use of caravan storage area to more permanent storage containers (more suitable in an industrial site) are very strongly opposed by local people. Previous use of the land was for Colliery housing which was demolished in the 40s and 50s. The site has deteriorated into a badly maintained eyesore with outdated shop fronts, but a Chemist, bookies and working garage offer jobs and services to local people. I am unsure when the land was designated for caravans but residents would like this area to be considered for future mixed use for housing and shops only. Ward Councillors support the use of this site for residential housing and shops only without prejudice.</p> | | | <p>the Local Plan. The next review of the SHLAA will include an appraisal of this site in Seaton Burn.</p> | <p>y of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|----------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| 396238 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20152091 | New Site: Seaton Burn - Land immediately to the South of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn was retained as open space in the Unitary Development Plan to enable there to be a clear distinction between the villages of Seaton Burn and Wideopen. There was support for this from local people but the land has become an eyesore and some have suggested that part, but not all of this land may be suitable for housing. Can this be considered please? | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 308). The SHLAA currently concludes that this site is unsuitable for residential development. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152105 | New Site: Land to the south of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn. Policy S7.3 outlines the preferred locations for housing development that, along with the two Strategic Sites, are to come forward to meet the housing requirement of 10,189 over the plan period. Although the total capacity of preferred housing locations and Strategic Sites exceed this requirement, our client considers that the housing requirement is too low and should be increased. It is also important to note that, as shown in Table 8, a significant proportion of housing delivery is dependent on all existing planning permissions being implemented. Our client considers that it is unlikely that all sites with planning permission or minded to grant permission will be fully developed. As such, it is likely that the outstanding housing requirement will be greater | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the plan period, based on the latest available evidence, and a range of suggested allocations to meet this need. It is considered that these allocations are deliverable/developable over the plan period to 2032. In addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now AS4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement. Further detailed analysis is available in the SHLAA. The Council is also continuing to work with neighbouring authorities, through the Duty to Cooperate arrangements, to determine the best spatial distribution of housing development across the wider sub-region. This site is located within the North | The sites allocated for housing development through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>than currently identified. In consideration of the above, our client questions whether the current supply identified through preferred housing locations and Strategic Sites will be sufficient to meet the housing requirement and that greater flexibility should be afforded. It is therefore considered that further sites for housing should be allocated. In addition, Policy S7.3 currently only identifies two preferred sites for housing development in Seaton Burn. These sites are "'Drift Inn' (Ref 133) and "'Site of former Seaton Burn First School' (Ref 141), with an anticipated yield of 8 and 6 dwellings respectively. It is clear that the combined yield of these sites will not be sufficient to meet the future housing needs of Seaton Burn over the plan period and that further sites in the settlement will be required to come forward. Housing development at our client's site will ensure that a sufficient supply of new homes is provided in Seaton Burn over the plan period, which makes a positive contribution to the settlement, whilst contributing towards the delivery of the Spatial Strategy. As such, it is considered that our client's site should be allocated for housing development.</p> | | | <p>Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 308). A Review has been undertaken to support the Local Plan, this concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period.</p> <p>Whilst delivery in Seaton Burn is limited by current constraints, it is considered that the Local Plan does make adequate provision for future housing delivery in the north west of the borough through the suggested allocations, a total supplemented by a significant number of dwellings with an outstanding planning permission yet to be built.</p> | |
| 396315 | Labour Party | MP | LP20152107 | Site 61: I would like to draw to your attention to concerns over proposals to develop on Norfolk Street Car Park. | Site 61 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | The Council is keen to promote the reuse of brownfield land in town centres and the Local Plan looks to focus development | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | Although redevelopment in this general area is welcome the car park is well used and could be part of redevelopment but remain as a public car park. St Columba's Church is an important part of our local community and many people using this church - during many days of the week - use this car park. Shoppers also use the car park to access the town centre. These are concerns which constituents have raised and I am at their request raising them with you to ask you to consider them. | | Housing Development Sites | within the main urban area. However, the need to deliver new homes is not looked at in isolation and Policy S6.1 (now S3.1) aims to pursue growth and regeneration of town centres by delivering new development, but only when this is appropriate and not detrimental to existing circumstances. One priority of this policy is to enhance accessibility by all modes of transport and any proposals which would result in the loss of existing car parking would have to be carefully considered through the planning process, including the resulting impact on existing shopping and community facilities, such as St Columba's URC. The Council also has a Parking Strategy which aims to manage the provision of parking in the borough which will provide further guidance. | |
| 808139 | | RESIDENT | LP20152112 | Site 35 - 41: Further to my recent letter, it has come to my attention that further alterations to the Site Ref: 35 - 41 Murton have been made but not included in the recent consultation . These concern the offset biodiversity land from the site at the Rising Sun County Park. It appears that the land to the north north/west of Murton has now been designated a nature/wetland area to compensate for the above loss at the Rising Sun County Park. Therefore more hedgerows trees etc. will have to be provided for the habitat of the affected wildlife. This wetland will no doubt accommodate some of the flood prevention measures required for | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|------------------------|
| | | | | West Monkseaton. If this offset biodiversity land is to be accommodated on this site the main road that is indicated on the consultation will have to be revised as it cuts through the middle of the allocated land. Also the public rights of way will have to be addressed, or are they to be sacrificed for progress. It appears that the consultation is flawed as various major alterations are being made and the general public are not made aware of this. If these were in the pipeline why could they not have been included in an appendix to the plan? | | | <p>settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. In addition any issues around PROW will also have to be addressed.</p> <p>Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site.</p> <p>The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152116 | Site 27: Land at Castle Square, Backworth- we are informed that this allocation would have a major (which I assume to be substantial) negative effect on the setting of West Backworth Deserted Medieval Village, a scheduled ancient monument. What we are not told, however, is how and to what extent development of the site | Site 27 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The Deserted Medieval Village SAM is located within an area located adjacent to Site 27, and which has been identified through LPCD 2015 as suggested safeguarded land. An application for development of Site 27 will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to impact on the nearby SAM and, if necessary, propose measures to address | No amendment proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | would affect its significance. It is important for the Council to come to a view on whether or not this harm to significance is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh it. | | | and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152117 | Site 35 - 41: Site Ref. 35 and others: Murton Ai, Murton South West- we are informed that this site contains one of the few untouched historic rural landscapes in North Tyneside, providing a rural setting to the non-designated Murton Village, the last remaining village in the borough without designation. We are also informed that there are surviving earthworks which could relate to the original medieval settlement and its surrounding fields, as well as the potential for buried archaeological remains. We are told that development of the site would have a major (substantial) negative impact on its archaeology. Again, what we appear not yet to understand is how important these archaeological remains might be and how and to what extent development of the site would affect their significance. Were they to be of national importance they may require preservation in-situ and may severely hamper the ability of the site to be developed. The same assessment of the extent to which significance may be harmed or lost is required by the Council to enable it to come to a view | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. An important aspect of this work will be taking account of the medieval earthworks and archaeological remains. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of impacts and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | on whether or not this harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. The NPPF advises that in some cases field evaluation may be necessary in order to inform such assessment. | | | in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 901271 | | RESIDENT | LP20152192 | Site 17: Despite whatever reassurance you make the addition of further houses on this site (together with the 650 on the other side) is ridiculous. The traffic on station Road/Whitely Road is overwhelming due to the Quorum etc so more houses would not be acceptable. In addition it would add to the eyesore fro the top of Rising Sun Hill. I suggest anyone who proposes this should try to get to the Quorum on a morning at 8:15, the traffic is horrendous and I worry that any further lights will only add to the travel misery. | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. | No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space. |
| 807245 | | RESIDENT | LP20152193 | Site 35-41: Castle Park, looking over to Seghill as there is plenty land owing to the flooding in 2005 in which we were all flooded and out of our houses for some time. We don't want houses in the field making a country park like the Rising Sun. We need wildlife to survive. I am one of three semi's on the perimeter of Allendale Crescent, Shiremoor, we have a lovely view looking over to Wellfield Earsdon west | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | Monkseaton. The total shock of building a road and houses will run alongside our house to the left of my house there is a underwater storage tank which was put in 2006 this can't be built on ever. | | | deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 901286 | | RESIDENT | LP20152194 | Site 35 -41: No homes here. Murton | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | detailed masterplanning. |
| 798761 | | RESIDENT | LP20152197 | Site 35 - 41: Please avoid using land around Murton. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 798761 | | RESIDENT | LP20152198 | Site 22 - 26: Please avoid using land at Killingworth Moor and (although too late?) don't build of land around Scaffold Farm West allotment. | Site 22 to 26 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. Planning permission (11/01600/FUL) was granted for 450 dwellings at Scaffold Hill Farm Scaffold Hill Farm - although this application was refused by North Tyneside Council Planning Committee, the developer appealed this decision and following a report by an independent Inspector the appeal was allowed in 2012. This site now has planning permission for 450 homes, delivery from which will contribute towards the overall housing requirement for the borough of the plan period. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 804541 | | | LP20152199 | Site 35 - 41: Objections as per previous. West Monkseaton can't cope | Site 35 to | S 7.3 Distribution of | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | with extra traffic for 300 houses never mind 3000! (4 roundabouts and 8 sets of lights in 1.1 miles, crazy). Murton to have identity protection, what about everyone else? Tracks/open land from West Monkseaton to Murton are one of the few open spaces available in the local area. Wildlife will also suffer. As per previous objections online "" unsure why we have to do it again. | 41 | Potential Housing Development Sites | prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 901305 | | RESIDENT | LP20152205 | Site 35-41: Proposal will impact in a negative way on wildlife and public bridle paths. Noise pollution in | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | (Murton)village from proposed road will be unbearable! Village life will be DESTROYED! Agriculture will be destroyed with urban pressure! Surely there are other sites that would cause less destruction if developed upon. Don't rip the heart out of a peaceful, beautiful village. | | Housing Development Sites | <p>site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. This includes the careful consideration of the most appropriate means of access from the existing network. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> <p>Importantly, the impact which the proposed</p> | sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | new link road will have upon the environment and existing community will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. | |
| 805333 | | RESIDENT | LP20152206 | <p>Site17: We need space left between areas and not merge into one, there seems to be more and more development on Greenfield sites in North Tyneside "" Holystone, Darsley Park and Palmersville. I am very disappointed at planning permission for 1100 houses next to the Rising Sun Country Park this is excessive on such a site, once fields have gone they cannot be replaced, traffic is increasing around these areas and particularly Whitley Road/Station Road Benton/Silverlink Cobalt. Wallsend Brownfield sites or EMPTY offices/buildings on business parks "" Cobalt on Balliol etc. stick to using Brownfield sites or ensuring empty property is used/renovated. The loss of green fields in North Tyneside is harming biodiversity and residents well being. We need to protect and preserve character and identities. Traffic congestion is really bad around Whitley Road Benton.</p> | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Cobalt Business Park (NT030) is allocated for employment purposes, reflected in the strategic Policy S5.1 (now S2.1) and AS5.6 (now AS2.6). As a result, these areas are generally not considered appropriate for residential development with the preferred focus being on economic and employment growth.</p> | |
| 805333 | | RESIDENT | LP20152209 | Site 120: We need space left between areas and not merge into one, there seems to be more and more development on Greenfield sites in North Tyneside "" Holystone, Darsley Park and Palmersville. I am very disappointed at planning permission for 1100 houses next to the Rising Sun Country Park this is excessive on such a site, once fields have gone they cannot be replaced, traffic is increasing around these areas and particularly Whitley Road/Station Road Benton/Silverlink Cobalt. Wallsend Brownfield sites or EMPTY offices/buildings on business | Site 120 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>parks "" Cobalt on Balliol etc. stick to using Brownfield sites or ensuring empty property is used/renovated. The loss of green fields in North Tyneside is harming biodiversity and residents well being. We need to protect and preserve character and identities. Traffic congestion is really bad around Whitley Road Benton.</p> | | | <p>highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Cobalt Business Park (NT030) is allocated for employment purposes, reflected in the strategic Policy S5.1 (now S2.1) and AS5.6 (now AS2.6). As a result, these areas are generally not considered appropriate for residential development with the preferred focus being on economic and employment</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | growth. | |
| 805333 | | RESIDENT | LP20152211 | <p>Site 11 now Site E0101: We need space left between areas and not merge into one, there seems to be more and more development on Greenfield sites in North Tyneside "" Holystone, Darsley Park and Palmersville. I am very disappointed at planning permission for 1100 houses next to the Rising Sun Country Park this is excessive on such a site, once fields have gone they cannot be replaced, traffic is increasing around these areas and particularly Whitley Road/Station Road Benton/Silverlink Cobalt. Wallsend Brownfield sites or EMPTY offices/buildings on business parks "" Cobalt on Balliol etc. stick to using Brownfield sites or ensuring empty property is used/renovated. The loss of green fields in North Tyneside is harming biodiversity and residents well being. We need to protect and preserve character and identities. Traffic congestion is really bad around Whitley Road Benton.</p> | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of</p> | <p>No amendments proposed. Larger development sites are supported by an indicative plan setting out potential access points and open space.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Cobalt Business Park (NT030) is allocated for employment purposes, reflected in the strategic Policy S5.1 (now S2.1) and then AS5.5 (now AS2.5) and AS5.6 (now AS2.6). As a result, these areas are generally not considered appropriate for residential development with the preferred focus being on economic and employment growth.</p> | |
| 805333 | | RESIDENT | LP20152212 | <p>Site 139: We need space left between areas and not merge into one, there seems to be more and more development on Greenfield sites in North Tyneside "" Holystone, Darsley Park and Palmersville. I am very disappointed at planning permission for 1100 houses next to the Rising Sun Country Park this is excessive on such a site, once fields have gone they cannot be replaced, traffic is increasing around these areas and particularly Whitley Road/Station Road Benton/Silverlink Cobalt. Wallsend Brownfield sites or EMPTY offices/buildings on business parks "" Cobalt on Balliol etc. stick to using Brownfield sites or ensuring empty property is used/renovated. The</p> | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>loss of green fields in North Tyneside is harming biodiversity and residents well being. We need to protect and preserve character and identities. Traffic congestion is really bad around Whitley Road Benton.</p> | | | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Cobalt Business Park (NT030) is allocated for employment purposes, reflected in the strategic Policy S5.1 (now S2.1) and AS5.6 (now AS2.6). As a result, these areas are generally not considered appropriate for residential development with the preferred focus being on economic and employment growth.</p> | |
| 805333 | | RESIDENT | LP20152213 | Gosforth Park: We need space left between areas and not merge into | Distributio | S 7.3 Distribution of | A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned | The sites allocated for housing development |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>one, there seems to be more and more development on Greenfield sites in North Tyneside "" Holystone, Darsley Park and Palmersville. I am very disappointed at planning permission for 1100 houses next to the Rising Sun Country Park this is excessive on such a site, once fields have gone they cannot be replaced, traffic is increasing around these areas and particularly Whitley Road/Station Road Benton/Silverlink Cobalt. Wallsend Brownfield sites or EMPTY offices/buildings on business parks "" Cobalt on Balliol etc. stick to using Brownfield sites or ensuring empty property is used/renovated. The loss of green fields in North Tyneside is harming biodiversity and residents well being. We need to protect and preserve character and identities. Traffic congestion is really bad around Whitley Road Benton.</p> | n | Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in</p> | <p>through the Local Plan have been updated to reflect the latest housing land supply evidence, including the deliverability/developability of sites as outlined the 2015 SHLAA.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Cobalt Business Park (NT030) is allocated for employment purposes, reflected in the strategic Policy S5.1 (now S2.1) and AS5.6 (now AS2.6). As a result, these areas are generally not considered appropriate for residential development with the preferred focus being on economic and employment growth.</p> | |
| 901309 | Council for British Archaeology North | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152221 | Site 27: We concur with the comments of English Heritage in considering the sensitivity of this site immediately to the east of a Scheduled Monument. | Site 27 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Deserted Medieval Village SAM is located within an area located adjacent to Site 27, and which has been identified through LPCD 2015 as suggested safeguarded land. An application for development of Site 27 will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to impact on the nearby SAM and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | No amendments proposed. |
| 901309 | Council for British Archaeology North | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152222 | Sites 35 to 41: Concerning the preserved field system remains around Murton we would suggest that these are of importance in themselves, but we also draw your attention to other locations (such as in comparable Northumberland) where the removal | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. An important aspect of this work will be taking account of the medieval earthworks and archaeological</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | of ridge and furrow earthworks have led to the fresh exposure of underlying remains of prehistoric and Romano-British periods requiring investigative archaeological work | | | remains. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site, notably work will continue with the County Archaeologist in our Plan preparation. | shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 901337 | | RESIDENT | LP20152223 | Site 35-41: I am still against housing on this site due to reasons stated by many at the last consultation e.g. loss of green fields. I hadn't realised a road would be built on the Earsdon side of the Metro and am also against this for the same reasons plus added noise pollution and concern about possible flooding from run off from road. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. Importantly, the impact which the proposed new link road will have upon the Green Belt and wider environment will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 901338 | | RESIDENT | LP20152226 | Site 128: with regard to the new North Tyneside Council Plan, I wish to express | Site 128 | S 7.3 Distribution of | Support for designation noted. Following further assessment through the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | that I strongly support the plans to designate the "'Benton Curve' (disused railway) as a Wildlife Corridor. | | Potential Housing Development Sites | Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. | |
| 901340 | | RESIDENT | LP20152227 | Site 52: The site proposed is already near busy roads and junctions. During work and after this will increase the risk of injuries and accidents. The need for housing should not compromise others safety and comfort. The junctions with Deepdale and Derwent at Honistor Road is already tight and busy at times. Cars already nearly crash into each other without increased traffic and disturbance from building work. The roads are used by both cars and pedestrians trying to get to the 3 schools in the area (Marden High, Monkhouse Primary and St Mary's primary) Increase traffic would be dangerous for the children and parents. The green space that is currently at site 52 is used by many children and others such as dog walkers. The space provides an area for children to play safely close to their houses so that parents are aware of their location. Nearest park or other space is Links field 400m away and across a busy road. As a PE teacher I find it irresponsible of the Council to be taking such a space away when obesity in children is so high. Where are children supposed to "'play' and | Site 52 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. The precise impact on the local highway network arising from a proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured in order for development to be acceptable. This would include addressing safety concerns and ensuring suitable access for pedestrians. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | exercise if you take all available space away? A field is a FREE area for them. I have been in my house for 21 months and concerned that these new houses would a) decrease the values of my house b) cause great disruption to the access to my house both before and after build c) increase the dangers of car and pedestrian accidents (I have a 6month old baby who will now have nowhere to play when she grows up and will have to be VERY careful with on walks). Comfort of others should be respected the new houses would block many peoples houses that line the space designated. This is NOT an appropriate space for new housing. I do not have and alternative site as that is NOT my job. These are many housing sites that are not full so concentrating on filling them and allowing people to get onto the property ladder should be looked at first. | | | | |
| | | | LP20152234 | New Site: There is derelict land available in the Shiremoor area i.e. land opposite the Blue Bell pub | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. This land has been identified as safeguarded for strategic transport purposes through the Local Plan, in order to retain the potential for a future light rail connection between | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------|------------|--|-------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>Northumberland Park and Howdon - the Cobalt Corridor link. This is supported through Local Plan Policy S10.3 (now S7.3), with the route being shown on the Policies Map.</p> <p>This site has been assessed through the SHLAA (Site 295) however, due to significant flood risk issues which are considered to prevent development at the current time, it is considered unsuitable for residential development.</p> | |
| | | | LP20152235 | New Site: There is derelict land available in the Shiremoor area i.e. the site on Park Lane where the Beaumont pub was demolished. | New site | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan.</p> <p>This site (SHLAA ref 401) has been assessed through the SHLAA but is subject to a permitted application for a care home (C2 use) and therefore, at the time of selecting sites, it was considered that there was insufficient evidence of availability in order to justify a residential allocation. However, if this scheme is not progressed, the site may come forward for residential development in the plan period and could make a contribution to overall housing need. An allowance is made for these type of sites in the windfall projection figure.</p> | No amendments proposed. |
| 901347 | | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATI | LP20152236 | Site 11 now Site E0101: Object | Site 11 now | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | ON | | | Site E0101 | Housing Development Sites | | |
| 808545 | | RESIDENT | LP20152240 | Site 35 - 41: Significant development around Murton village is impractical for so many reasons, the many negatives are covered within NTC 2013 consultation so I won't revisit. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 808545 | | RESIDENT | LP20152242 | New Site: Employment site 107 - Why not develop this brown field site for housing? Not shown for development but good access to Earsdon bypass | Site 107 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site (110/NT012) has been identified as a suggested location for employment uses, helping to meet the need for land to support economic development over the plan period. | No amendments proposed. |
| 808545 | | RESIDENT | LP20152243 | Site 77: Why not develop this brown field site for housing? Not shown for development but good access to Earsdon bypass | Site 77 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This site is included in the Local Plan as a suggested allocation for mixed-use development. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the wider area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals are likely to be for residential redevelopment supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | No amendments proposed. |
| 808545 | | RESIDENT | LP20152244 | Site 78: Why not develop this brown field site for housing? Not shown for development but good access to Earsdon bypass | Site 78 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development | This site is included in the Local Plan as a suggested allocation for mixed-use development. The mixed-use designation will seek to provide a strategy to help manage ongoing change, improving the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | Sites | wider area and working with businesses that wish to remain, in order to understand their requirements, in a proactive manner. Proposals are likely to be for residential redevelopment supported by, and integrated with, employment, commercial and, potentially, retail uses. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | |
| 808545 | | RESIDENT | LP20152245 | New Site: Land between Earsdon, West Monkseaton and Shiremoor | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. This area is already identified as a suggested site through the proposed Murton strategic allocation (Site 35 to 41) - see Policies S7.3 (now S4.3) and S7.4 (now S4.4). | No amendments proposed. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152248 | Site 35 - 41: The Murton Strategic Site can therefore be considered to represent a form of sustainable development | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Support for development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901541 | | RESIDENT | LP20152343 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links.</p> | |
| 901541 | | RESIDENT | LP20152346 | <p>Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site.</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 901549 | | RESIDENT | LP20152354 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 901549 | | RESIDENT | LP20152357 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152365 | Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152369 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy | Site 35 to | S 7.3 Distribution of | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | 41 | Potential Housing Development Sites | prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 898630 | | | LP20152373 | Site 17: Station Road, Wallsend - Objection Petition against proposals to build on the last remaining green fields in Benton and Wallsend. Petition objects to the proposed allocation of sites 17, 111, 139, and 110 for housing and industrial development, as | Site 17 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Receipt of petition and issues raised acknowledged. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>outlined in the latest version of the Local Plan. Sites 111 and 139 have been added since the last consultation and planning permission has already been granted for East Benton Rise and various other developments in the area. As of 3pm 27th March, the petition contains 953 signatures. They were obtained in a very short space of time and with little organised effort. The number and type of comments demonstrate the depth of feeling and concern over this particular issue. The comments cover a wide range of issues that are categorised below. They apply to sections 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10 of your proposals in the local plan: A range of additional comments in support of the petition were made and can be viewed online through the attachment to this comment. Comment - Loss of green space - number of references - 275 Comment - Traffic/Infrastructure - number of references - 134 Comment - Over/inappropriate/disjointed development of the area - number of references - 79 Comment - Loss of wildlife - number of references - 45 Comment - Quality of Life - number of references - 43 Comment - Preservation for future generations - number of references - 35 Comment - Council will not listen - number of references - 15 Comment - Schools/Health - number of references - 13 Comment - Flooding - number of</p> | | | <p>year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | references - 12 Comment - Other - number of references - 9 In light of the above, I, and 952 others, hope you will reconsider your proposals for building on what is the last remaining green space in the area and retain them as green space. | | | highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The importance of community services, including education and healthcare facilities, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. Any application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of site issues and constraints, including those relating to flood risk and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 901563 | | RESIDENT | LP20152374 | Site 35 - 41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 901564 | | RESIDENT | LP20152381 | Site 35 - 41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 898630 | | | LP20152385 | Site 11 now Site E0101: East Benton Farm - Objection Petition against proposals to build on the last remaining green fields in Benton and Wallsend. Petition objects to the proposed allocation of sites 17, 111, 139, and 110 for housing and industrial development, as outlined in the latest version of the Local Plan. Sites 111 and 139 have been added since the last consultation and planning permission has already been granted for East Benton Rise and various other developments in the area. As of 3pm 27th March, the petition contains 953 signatures. They were obtained in a very short space of time and with little organised effort. The number and type of comments demonstrate the depth of feeling and concern over this particular issue. The comments cover a wide range of issues that are categorised below. They apply to sections 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10 of your proposals in the local plan: A range of | Site 11 now Site E0101 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Receipt of petition and issues raised acknowledged. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>additional comments in support of the petition were made and can be viewed online through the attachment to this comment. Comment - Loss of green space - number of references - 275 Comment - Traffic/Infrastructure - number of references - 134 Comment - Over/inappropriate/disjointed development of the area - number of references - 79 Comment - Loss of wildlife - number of references - 45 Comment - Quality of Life - number of references - 43 Comment - Preservation for future generations - number of references - 35 Comment - Council will not listen - number of references - 15 Comment - Schools/Health - number of references - 13 Comment - Flooding - number of references - 12 Comment - Other - number of references - 9 In light of the above, I, and 952 others, hope you will reconsider your proposals for building on what is the last remaining green space in the area and retain them as green space.</p> | | | <p>wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The importance of community services, including education and healthcare facilities, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. Any application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of site issues and constraints, including those relating to flood risk and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 898630 | | | LP20152386 | <p>Site 139: Darsley Park - Objection</p> <p>Petition against proposals to build on the last remaining green fields in Benton and Wallsend. Petition objects to the proposed allocation of sites 17, 111, 139, and 110 for housing and industrial development, as outlined in the latest version of the Local Plan. Sites 111 and 139 have been added since the last consultation and planning permission has already been granted for East Benton Rise and various other developments in the area. As of 3pm 27th March, the petition contains 953 signatures. They were obtained in a very short space of time and with little organised effort. The number and type of comments demonstrate the depth of feeling and concern over this particular issue. The comments cover a wide range of issues that are categorised below. They apply to sections 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10 of your proposals in the local plan: A range of additional comments in support of the petition were made and can be viewed online through the attachment to this comment. Comment - Loss of green space - number of references - 275 Comment - Traffic/Infrastructure - number of references - 134 Comment - Over/inappropriate/disjointed development of the area - number of</p> | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Receipt of petition and issues raised acknowledged.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3)</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>references - 79 Comment - Loss of wildlife - number of references - 45 Comment - Quality of Life - number of references - 43 Comment - Preservation for future generations - number of references - 35 Comment - Council will not listen - number of references - 15 Comment - Schools/Health - number of references - 13 Comment - Flooding - number of references - 12 Comment - Other - number of references - 9 In light of the above, I, and 952 others, hope you will reconsider your proposals for building on what is the last remaining green space in the area and retain them as green space.</p> | | | <p>and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For Station Road West and East Benton Farm, key access arrangements will already be established as part of the permitted scheme at Station Road East. Meanwhile additional improvements to ensure severe impacts on highways and continued promotion of sustainable travel including bus, cycling and walking must be integral to any proposal. The importance of community services, including education and healthcare facilities, is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. Any application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of site issues and constraints, including those relating to flood risk and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate these issues in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152389 | <p>Site 35-41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far</p> | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. | | Sites | As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152398 | Site 35- 41: My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 901558 | | RESIDENT | LP20152401 | Site 35 - 41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | | | considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 901560 | | RESIDENT | LP20152404 | Site 35 - 41: As a local resident Cobalt Business Park is already having a significant detrimental effect on my property due to increased traffic. Given that Cobalt Business Park is still far from capacity, this will get worse over the coming years without further homes being built. The addition of a maximum of 3000 new homes at Murton would significantly add to this problem. My concern is primarily regarding the Transport Policy referencing Road Network. In particular concern to the increased traffic as a result of continued adoption of premises at Cobalt and with the proposed introduction of a further 3000 Homes at the Murton site. | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. A wide range of road and public transport | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 901591 | | RESIDENT | LP20152417 | Site 21: Looking at the attached map it seems that the pink site marked No.21 is the children's playing field? Can someone please call me to clear this up, as I may be mistaken. Thank you. If I am correct in thinking this is the children's playing field I am opposing it for obvious reasons. My 4 children as well as all the other children in Holystone will have nowhere to play, dog walkers also use this field, especially the elderly people who can't walk far enough to go anywhere else. Also me and my family have used this field for recreational activities for over 50 years. My family has lived in Windsor place for a very long time and from my Nana and Granda to their great grand children we have all used this field for recreational activities and still continue to do so. I have spoken to people in Holystone and the majority of people have not received this leaflet and are unaware of the latest proposals. However quite a few have | Site 21 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | This proposed site for residential development is currently designated through the UDP as part open space and part allocated employment land. As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|------------------|------------|--|------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | already explained they have already opposed this only 2-4 years ago. Please forward any info to my email. Thank you. | | | | |
| 471172 | | RESIDENT | LP20152418 | Site 139: Darsley Park - Objection Covering letter submitted to petition objecting to Site 139 with 42 signatures. We the undersigned wish to oppose the proposal in the Local Plan to develop the field (ref no 139) for housing. We believe that with the developments around the Rising Sun Countryside Park and Tyne View Park which already have planning permission, the current development at Darsley Green and the proposed development on the site of the old St Bartholomew's School (ref no 15) the traffic on Whitley Road will be at saturation point. In addition any development of the field will lead to yet more junctions on to a stretch of road that is already very busy. There is also a local nursery, the Quarry Park, the Blue Flames Club and NUFC training ground which attract many young people on foot. In addition there was a promise made when the training ground was built that any future development of the field would be for community sport. We ask the Cabinet member to reconsider this site and remove it as designated housing development. | Site 139 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Receipt of petition and issues raised acknowledged. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed or planned for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. The specific impact of each proposal will require assessment on a site-specific basis and appropriate improvements secured for development to be acceptable. For the proposed site at Darsley Park this includes crucial assessment of the impacts upon Whitley Road and ensuring safe pedestrian links to and from the development and to facilities in the wider area. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898939 | 38 Degrees North | | LP20152419 | Site 35 to 41: Murton Objection Petition with 273 signatures submitted | Site 35 to | S 7.3 Distribution of | Receipt of petition and issues raised acknowledged. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | Tyneside East | | | as objection to the suggested strategic allocation Murton, site 35 to 41 - against the proposed 3,000 home development around the Shiremoor, Monkseaton area and Road. See comment LP2015987 for further comment on behalf of 38 Degrees North Tyneside East. | 41 | Potential Housing Development Sites | | |
| 901605 | | RESIDENT | LP20152420 | Site 35 - 41: I am enclosing a signed petition (144 signatures) from the residents of Murton Village opposing the proposals contained in the Consultation for Areas 35- 41 Murton Village for 3000 houses plus a road/dual carriageway in and around the village. We understand that this is only a consultation document but after discussion with the majority of the residents in Murton, we wish to record our opposition to the proposals contained in the Consultation , pending further discussions with our local councillors and local MP regarding this matter. In the meantime, I would respectfully ask you to look at the findings of the 1986 Government Inspectors Public Inquiry into a similar proposed development, which, at the time, North Tyneside Council were wholeheartedly against and put forward strong arguments for disallowing those proposals, which bore many similarities to the current proposals, albeit (ironically) on a smaller scale. In fact, North Tyneside and the local residents were successful | Site 35 to 41 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | Receipt of petition and issues raised acknowledged. Comment noted with regard to previous proposal for development. Even following allocation, a planning application(s) for the proposed strategic site will require approval before any development can commence. Such an application will be judged on merit through the development management process. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | in their opposition We do have a copy of Nicholas Ridley's. (Secretary of State for the Environment and Transport at the time), Government Inspector's report and findings, the conclusions of which, we believe, to hold true today. We would welcome your comments. | | | | |
| 902266 | UKIP Representative | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152428 | <p>Site 45: Charlton Court / Cedar Tree Gardens - Objection</p> <p>Petition signed by 250 residents with following supporting letter.</p> <p>North Tyneside Council's Local Plan 2015 proposes the building of houses on the field between Churchill Avenue and Cedartree Gardens on Hillheads estate.</p> <p>This field is very popular with the children of our estate since there are not many places locally they can actually play safely. The Council publicly encourages better health and wellbeing and we all know that inactivity and obesity in children is an increasing problem.</p> <p>The nearest play park for children is next to the metro line at Marmion Terrace; this is too far away for many children to travel without their parents.</p> <p>We propose that the Council removes this site from its building plan and instead commits to building a children's play park for local residents. Two such parks have actually been removed from other locations within Hillheads estate. This is the perfect</p> | Site 45 | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>Receipt of petition and issues raised acknowledged.</p> <p>As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision.</p> <p>The suggestion of improvements to existing open space will be considered including, if necessary, through the Local Plan process.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | location since it is surrounded by houses and quiet roads. | | | | |
| 808139 | | RESIDENT | LP20152430 | <p>Site Serious consideration should be given to solving the traffic congestion that arises at rush hour and peak times during the day with traffic entering and leaving the confines of the Cobalt Business Park and the Silverlink. The local omnibus operators have had to alter their timetables at certain times of the day due to the severe congestion of traffic at various times of the day, resulting in the knock on effects of delayed public transportation. With hindsight these problems should have been addressed when Cobalt was originally developed. On the afternoon of Thursday 2nd April last, the traffic came very close to gridlock with the A191 blocked from the A19 to the B1316 including Norham Road North, the B1322, also the Silverlink North including Silverfox Way, Middle Engine Lane both ways and the Silverlink to the A1058. This occurrence brought out the best in some of the motorists who decided the laws of the road did not apply to them, trying to do 3 point turns, blocking exits and lanes they did not want to be in. This resulted in a (30) minute bus journey from Newcastle to New York taking one hour and forty minutes (1hr 40mins).</p> <p>This is now becoming a regular occurrence and needs to be addressed</p> | General | S 7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites | <p>A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | before the new housing development to be built on Shiremoor/Murton greenfield site with the large increase of motor vehicles that will accompany this development. | | | | |
| 878656 | | RESIDENT | LP20157 | I have just received a copy of your Local Plan Consultation regarding further housing in the Killingworth area. How can this be justified whilst the shopping facilities in the area are so poor? No one that I know is against more housing in the area, but surely it must be in balance with proper 21st century shopping facilities. I can only hope you take this into consideration before building commences. | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 2,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. As part of the Masterplan, the requirement for additional services and facilities will also be considered, including the need for additional retail provision. More generally, Policy S6.1 provides the strategic context so future retail provision in the borough, setting out a policy for growth, regeneration and support for main town centre development. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 878568 | | | LP201514 | How can you say that your green infrastructure strategy will retain, enhance and increase the biodiversity of each site. There is a huge amount of land covered in hedgerows and trees that have been included in site 39, next to the metro line. These will be destroyed forever, along with all the wildlife that it sustains. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 878767 | | | LP201525 | There is uncertainty about the actual number of houses that will be required to be developed in the Borough by 2031/32. There is also uncertainty about the actual location of sites that will be available to provide the required housing. The commencement of any development of housing on these two strategic areas of previously safeguarded land Murton (sites 35-41) and Killingworth Moor (sites 22-26) should therefore be delayed until towards the end of the planning period i.e. years 11-15. This will mean correcting the dates for the commencement of development currently being shown for some of the Murton and Killingworth Moor sites on the planning schedule. By deferring the commencement of any housing development on the Murton and Killingworth Moor sites until after year 11 of the plan will ensure that by that time the forecasted demand for housing has actually materialised and no other, currently unknown but more suitable sites for housing development have become available in the | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested development sites, Policy S7.3 (now S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/develop ability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. A positive and proactive Local Plan is required, allocating enough land to meet the identified requirement, to guide development to the most sustainable locations. It is considered that the strategic sites are required to meet the housing need, with the SHLAA and housing trajectory setting out the forecast delivery. Without such an approach, the Council will not be able to identify a 5-year supply of deliverable sites and will have limited | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | meantime. This will then also ensure that no housing development is carried out unnecessarily on these previously safeguarded areas and would comply with the Council's stated aim of protecting the region's green infrastructure (see Policy DM8.2). In accordance with paragraph S11.1 of the Plan, it is the Council's intention to "maintain a rolling 5 year supply of deliverable housing land." The need to subsequently defer or accelerate the commencement of housing development on these two major greenfield areas can therefore be formally monitored and decided on a 5 yearly basis dependent on actual housing need and/or availability of other more suitable development locations. It is important not to commit to early in the 15 year planning period to developing housing on these previously safeguarded sites. | | | control over the location of new development. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 4,500 homes, between the two sites, in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | |
| 878767 | | | LP201538 | As already noted in Paragraph 7.36 of the Plan, only a proportion of the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites will be required to meet the Borough's need for housing development by 2032. Indeed, as the planning period progresses, it may even be found that as a result of changes in housing demand and the identification of other more suitable development sites, very little if any of these strategic sites will be required | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need and identify a requirement over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | for development. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the above, it is critical that during the period up to 2032, no housing development takes place on Site 39 (Murton D), Site 40 (Murton E), the northern part of Site 37 (Murton C) and the eastern part of Site 41 (Murton B). This is because any housing development on these sites would unnecessarily extend the existing urban sprawl of West Monkseaton, cause further traffic overload to the A192 Earsdon Road - Seatonville Road which is already at maximum capacity and can not be increased, close the wildlife corridor that links East Holywell to Marden Nature Reserve, and remove the greenfield corridor that separates West Monkseaton from Shiremoor, Billy Mill and Preston. | | | specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 4,500 homes, between the two sites, in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with the Murton site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 879350 | | | LP201539 | Not content inflicting your nonsense onto the residents of Earsdon, Shiremoor and Wellfield with the West Park development, I'm stunned (but not surprised) that you're considering | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | building a road from Earsdon across GREEN BELT to Silverlink. Have you lost your minds? Expect significant opposition to this if you try and go ahead. | | | sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. Importantly, the impact which the proposed new link road will have upon the environment, including the Green Belt, will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. | the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 879463 | | RESIDENT | LP201541 | When I get any literature I am interested on what is NOT said. I read with interest the "What you told us - You said - We've listened" section In the final part on sites for Murton and Killingworth Moor, you focus on only one of the several concerns made. I take it you are not "listening" to the remaining concerns:- * Possible harm to character and identities of the area * Traffic congestion * Schools and health facilities capacity * Flooding Do I take it that due to your lack of response you are not listening to what residents consider to be highly important issues and you do not consider a response necessary? Possibly excluding the questionnaire on the back of the leaflet would have given you more space to have the decency to respond to residents major concerns (to show that you are actually listening). Even a sentence would have been helpful to say we will respond under separate cover to all concerns | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Within the Consultation Leaflet, the "You Said - We've Listened" section in relation to the strategic sites referred directly to the map overleaf - on which further points regarding character and identity, roads and public transport, education health and other infrastructure, and flooding were all set out. In addition following consultation on the Local Plan Consultation 2013 a full schedule of comments was published by the Council, including an Officer response to each representation made. This is available to view on the Council website. Similarly, this schedule provides an Officer response to each point raised during consultation on LPCD 2015. If further feedback or clarification is required please contact the Planning Policy team using your preferred method. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | raised. | | | | |
| 444604 | | RESIDENT | LP201585 | <p>At the end of the Second World War the Councils (Whitley and Tynemouth) told us that the open land from Preston Cemetery to Shiremoor was reserved as green belt and a connective route for wildlife! Now Preston Cemetery to Rake Lane has been 100% built up! So much for your promises. Now you propose to build on the half of the green belt remaining. Ye gods what next, one of our members reckons that in the next 50 years there will be red brick from Shields to Berwick! Killingworth Moor has only one right of way crossing it. Please restrict the amount of building between Murton and West Monkseaton and build between Killingworth and Castle Park instead. However Seatonville Road and Earsdon Road and Whitley Road to Earsdon can't handle the present traffic or if you must build houses between Murton, Earsdon, West Monkseaton and Rake Lane we urgently need an expensive new main road from Earsdon Red Lion pub to Rake Lane Hospital with connections to Cauldwell Avenue and Monkseaton Drive. There is very little traffic from the north side of Killingworth to Castle Park so building here would be preferable. There is a good direct route from Killingworth to Wideopen which would</p> | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need and identify a requirement for the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) (now Policies s1.4 and S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Neither Killingworth Moor nor the land surrounding Murton is Green Belt. The current extent of the North Tyneside Green Belt was formally designated on adoption of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP, 2002). This is a statutory planning designation and not all open or agricultural land is designated as Green Belt. The land at Killingworth Moor and Murton, is designated as safeguarded land through the UDP, this is land which is identified as potentially being required for development beyond the relevant plan period, in the case</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | take much more traffic with connections to Seghill, Shiremoor and Backworth. | | | <p>of the UDP after 2006.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes, in the most suitable areas of the sites and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. This includes the careful consideration of the most appropriate means of access from the existing network. The improvements to the</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, this includes detailed assessment of the most appropriate route for proposed new roads and any mitigation measures necessary to make these proposals acceptable. | |
| 890440 | | RESIDENT | LP2015137 | The Green Belt boundary at Shiremoor is not the lower extent of green land. I believe strongly that the green area to the east of Murton should also be protected. Failure to do so pushes the natural land further north. The west of Murton is adjacent to industrial and residential properties and less precious as a result. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The current extent of the North Tyneside Green Belt was formally designated on adoption of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP, 2002). This is a statutory planning designation and not all open or agricultural land is designated as Green Belt. The land between Shiremoor and West Monkseaton, and surrounding Murton, is designated as safeguarded land through the UDP, this is land which is identified as potentially being required for development beyond the relevant plan period, in the case of the UDP after 2006.</p> <p>The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need and identify a requirement for the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development and it has been determined that the strategic site at Murton is required to meet some of the identified need.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of</p> | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. | |
| 792504 | | | LP2015146 | The loss of Killingworth Moor is not acceptable. | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890535 | | | LP2015150 | Having received the through the door I would like to know why Murton will have a buffer zone. I would prefer to see the whole of that area as a green field site and no more housing to be built around Shiremoor. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) (now Policies DM1.4 and S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need and identify a requirement for the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development and it has been determined that the strategic site at Murton is required to meet some of the identified need.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. As part of this a strategic settlement buffer is proposed in order to prevent merging of existing communities and retain the individual character and identity of settlements, including Murton Village. | |
| 792504 | | | LP2015154 | In particular the wholesale loss of Killingworth Moor will be regrettable as it the land is elevated and can be seen from many local communities in Killingworth Palmersville, Forest Hall, Holystone and Backworth. Already many of the villages in North Tyneside simply merge into each other with the resultant loss of historic identity. With the proposed additional housing, it will become one urban sprawl and less attractive place to live. The current road networks are already under strain especially the A191 Whitley Road and the B1505 Great Lime Road which at peak times are almost at capacity. | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and Great Lime Road. | |
| 890843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015162 | Sites 22 to 26: clearly conflicts with wildlife corridor. However, the Killingworth Moor development is supported since Holystone already breaks the green belt/ribbon. | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Support for development noted. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 890843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015164 | Site 35 to 41: clearly conflicts with wildlife corridor. The area around Murton should become protected. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity, this includes the setting of Murton village. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised.</p> | |
| 890854 | | RESIDENT | LP2015168 | Site 35 to 41: There should be no housing built around Murton Village . | Site 35 to | AS 7.4 Strategic Site | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | With houses already encroaching on Earsdon, Murton is the last remaining village in North Tyneside. With the borough fast becoming one huge housing estate it is essential to keep at least one true village. | 41 | Allocations | prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity, this includes the setting of Murton village. | |
| 890859 | | RESIDENT | LP2015175 | Murton and Killingworth Moor - my home was flooded in 2012 - surface water from fields - and I am concerned about flooding issues for both any new homes as well as existing ones in the area. Another concern is for the traffic and any new planned roads. | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes, in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints, including flood risk. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. | |
| 890912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015183 | I believe, with the correct development, the Murton Estate has the potential to be an attractive and efficient housing site. It is important that the development is sustainable and has a positive impact on the region's infrastructure. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Support for development noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 891832 | | RESIDENT | LP2015210 | I note that the plan stipulates that, "Agreed master plans will be required before development takes place, which must: Provide a new primary and | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | As part of the masterplanning process for both strategic sites, the requirement for additional services and facilities will also be considered, including the requirement for | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | secondary school.....". North Tyneside currently has surplus places in all of its secondary schools. Marden High School is currently experiencing a significant budget deficit due to the loss of one of its three 'feeder' primary schools through the creation of Kings Priory. I therefore question whether it is prudent to build a new secondary school. I would invite you to consider whether children and young people from the new Murton development could be directed to existing secondary schools. If this caused a problem over 'over-subscription' to a nearby existing High School, like Monkseaton High School, then it would not be difficult to transfer one of its current feeder primary schools to Marden High School, thereby securing the viability of existing schools rather than further weakening them. | | | additional school. The Masterplan and the formal planning process will determine the most appropriate scale of such facilities and the best location in the borough. More generally, the importance of community services is reflected in Policies S10.13 (now S7.10) and S10.1 (now S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 464281 | | RESIDENT | LP2015247 | Traffic out of Killingworth Moor - access onto Great Lime Road will be too busy. | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. This includes critical resolution of matters relating to site access, including potential impacts upon Great Lime Road. | considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 892628 | | RESIDENT | LP2015264 | Road through Murton site - where will it meet Earsdon? Suggest joining with Red Lion roundabout or top of Caudwell Lane. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, this includes detailed assessment of the most appropriate route for the proposed new link road and any mitigation measures necessary to make this acceptable. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 798736 | | | LP2015266 | I do not feel that the proposed 'buffer' zone around the village is adequate to protect the identity of the village and to keep it separate from the ensuing urban sprawl that the level of building will engender. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. The Masterplan will further consider the exact scale, location and nature of the proposed strategic settlement buffer, in order to ensure that the threat of urban sprawl is prevented and to protect the character and identity of Murton village. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| | | | LP2015267 | I believe that this many buildings on the Murton site will increase the chance of flooding to the low lying areas of West Monkseaton, the amount of roadway and house drive building will take away natural soakways. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints, including flood risk. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 892757 | | | LP2015284 | Site 35 to 41: Traffic in the area of Seatonville Road, Earsdon Road, along into Whitley Bay, Rake Lane and North Shields is extremely busy; at some times of the day traffic is at a standstill. This is without the new development at Wellfield and the prospective new supermarket at Foxhunters (Hillheads). There have been proposals to create access roads from Murton to feed to Seatonville Road and Earsdon paving the way for housing developments to swallow the open spaces between | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. The Masterplan will further consider the exact scale, location and nature of the proposed strategic settlement buffer, in order to ensure that the threat of urban sprawl is prevented and to protect the | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Murton and Monkseaton. Murton would no longer be a village but a small town. This would have a huge negative impact to the surrounding areas that can't cope already. We do not more houses that are too big and costly for prospective buyers (an encouragement for those who can't afford to live in them to overextend themselves) but better utilisation of the empty houses already available.</p> | | | <p>character and identity of Murton village. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, this includes detailed assessment of the most appropriate route for proposed new roads and any mitigation measures necessary to make these proposals acceptable.</p> <p>The Local Plan includes a number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity.</p> <p>The role that long-term empty homes can play in providing additional housing is identified through the Local Plan and Policy S7.1 (now S4.1) includes the objective to bring empty homes back into use. An allowance for windfall development is made through the Local Plan, based on past trends and evidenced through the SHLAA, which provides a small proportion of the total housing requirement to 2032. This windfall allowance includes supply from bringing empty/vacant homes back into use.</p> | <p>exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 892980 | | RESIDENT | LP2015306 | <p>Site 35 to 41, Murton: Comment I attended your consultation meeting on 26 February at Shiremoor Resource centre and was told to forward any queries regarding the Murton build direct to your planning department. My main concern regarding the build is around the proposed new road leading from Earsdon through to New York. As I live in 286 New York Road this new road will be right next to my house and the other 2 houses in this block. I believe that this will not only infringe on our views and the local wild life but also create noise pollution. One of the other major factors is that the valuation of my property will decrease, who would want to live right next to a major road with traffic day and night passing by your door every day. The reason we bought this house originally was because of the location the lovely open aspect at the rear of the property overlooking fields as far as the eye can see. I questioned the gentleman at the meeting regarding using the existing Murton Lane as this is currently being used for traffic in and out of Murton village without any impact to anyone. This would be more beneficial to us as residents in New York as the road would have less of an impact on our homes and our lives. My other concern is the amount of extra traffic this would bring to an already congested road/roundabout, living opposite this</p> | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. The Masterplan will further consider the exact scale, location and nature of the proposed strategic settlement buffer, in order to ensure that the threat of urban sprawl is prevented and to protect the character and identity of Murton village. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, this includes detailed assessment of the most appropriate route for the proposed new link road and the potential impacts upon upon the environment, wildlife and the existing community. This will involve carefully consideration of the mitigation measure necessary to make development acceptable. Support for safeguarding of potential Metro extension route (Cobalt Corridor) noted.</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>road and being a car driver myself the amount of traffic that is using this road to get to the Cobalt, Silverlink and Rake Lane is far too congested therefore adding another road would be complete and utter madness. I was made aware of the Nexus plans to extend the Metro line through to the Cobalt and onto Percy Main which I feel is a good idea and one which I hope does take place but in the mean time another main road leading to the New York roundabout should be re-thought . I am aware that the position of this road is having the minimal impact on residents other than the two houses on Murton Lane and the three on the block in New York Road but as we have not yet been made aware of where the new houses will be built we feel that we are going to be railroaded on both accounts i.e. the loss of views and open aspects and the extra noise pollution from this main road. Although you have considered protecting Murton Village I don't feel any consideration has been given to the these houses which will be affected by the re-development. I hope you will take our views into consideration before the next planning meeting and try to accommodate our proposals regarding the new road.</p> | | | | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | <p>Site 22 to 26 Killingworth Moor: Comments and Objection . RE: LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION - OUR VIEWS .</p> | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | With regards to the recently published Local Plan Consultation and in particular to the area designated as Killingworth Moor/A19 Corridor on your "North Tyneside Suggested Sites for Development" plan please find the following pages detailing our views on the plan. . We have lived at Holystone Cottage which is on Holystone Farm and owned by ourselves for over five years having purchased it because of its semi-rural location, views/aspects of countryside and quietness, so to find our beloved property in the middle of a suggested strategic site for development comes as somewhat of a shock. We believe that communication from North Tyneside Council to ourselves prior to the mass distribution of this plan should have taken place and that the mere issue of this plan has devalued our property. . | | | site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: Introduction We have listed below the subject headings in a summary format each of which has a detailed description on the following pages:- (OFFICER NOTE _ LIST OMMITTED FROM ONLINE RESPONSE) Wildlife "Endangered Species . 1) The Great Crested Newt During 2014 a number of mature and adolescent Great Crested Newts were discovered in the vicinity of our property and the adjoining area of Killingworth Moor to our Garden. These were independently verified as the species by Dr Dave | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. This includes careful consideration of all species identified through this representation. The importance of local wildlife is recognised through a range of proposed policies, including through the incorporation of wildlife corridors into the development. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>Mitchell, Lead Adviser, Protected Sites: Regulation & Enforcement Delivery Team of Natural England along with the newt specialist Mr John Durkin. There were no previous records of this species at the location and the specialist has confirmed that they almost certainly came from the Holystone Site adjacent to our property. Following on from this Natural England instigated a Police Investigation to determine whether a breach of wildlife legislation had occurred in the draining of the ponds by the landowner on Killingworth Moor. . Following on from this the landowner requested a ploughing permit for the field from Natural England which was declined as it was designated a “semi-natural” area of habitat and the proposed ploughing works would be likely to have a significant effect on the environment due to likely impacts on semi-natural habitats, protected. The applicant (landowner) was asked to submit an Environmental Statement with a full assessment of the impacts of the proposal on the environmental features before and consent by Natural England, which we believe has not been issued as yet. The applicant was advised that no works should take place without such a consent. Therefore we would ask how this site could be considered for development</p> | | | <p>development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Key to this is the need to proactively plan for the protection and enhancement of wildlife habitats, including for the species identified, something which will be informed by the expert advice of organisations and individuals.</p> | <p>considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | and how the plan can clearly indicates a “Priority Transport Improvement” running directly through the area as well as housing and factories when is has been identified by Natural England as homing this protected species? . | | | | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 2) The Hedgehog Since 2011 we have been working along with Pricklepad Hedgehog Hospital who are a local volunteer Hedgehog Rehabilitation Centre, we have released a number of Hedgehogs from our garden into the surrounding fields of Killingworth Moor. . The Hedgehog is an endangered species and there are large numbers living across Killingworth Moor which revisit our garden very frequently, again our comments regarding the “Priority Transport Improvement” housing and factories will directly impact their semi-natural living environment and due to the vicinity of the site being landlocked by the railway lines and A19 the green or open spaces identified on the consultation maps suggested sites will not allow sufficient wildlife corridors. . | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. This includes careful consideration of all species identified through this representation. The importance of local wildlife is recognised through a range of proposed policies, including through the incorporation of wildlife corridors into the development. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Key to this is the need to proactively plan for the protection and enhancement of wildlife habitats, including for the species identified, something which will be informed by the expert advice of organisations and individuals. The direct and indirect impacts on | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability of proposed allocations. The Masterplan process for Killingworth Moor will guide the development in an appropriate way and will be informed by the expert advice of organisations and individuals. | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 3) The Kestrel A Kestrel can be seen hunting over the bottom end of Killingworth Moor adjacent to our house most days, this has been ever present since we moved into the house over five years ago, this species is a Bird of Prey and the Kestrel is listed as an endangered species any alterations to the area either on our surrounding the Killingworth Moor site will have a direct effect on the Kestrels natural habitat. . | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. This includes careful consideration of all species identified through this representation. The importance of local wildlife is recognised through a range of proposed policies, including through the incorporation of wildlife corridors into the development. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Key to this is the need to proactively plan for the protection and enhancement of wildlife habitats, including for the species identified, something which will be informed by the expert advice of organisations and individuals. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | The direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability of proposed allocations. The Masterplan process for Killingworth Moor will guide the development in an appropriate way and will be informed by the expert advice of organisations and individuals. | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 4) Nesting Owls The site surrounding our house has had Owls going back for decades, this year in particular we have been fortunate to have them nesting and the noise of the young Owlets can be heard on most nights, again the Owl is a protected species and any alterations to the area either on our surrounding the Killingworth Moor site will have a direct effect on the Owls natural habitat. . | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. This includes careful consideration of all species identified through this representation. The importance of local wildlife is recognised through a range of proposed policies, including through the incorporation of wildlife corridors into the development. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Key to this is the need to proactively plan for the protection and enhancement of wildlife habitats, including for the species identified, something which will be informed by the expert advice of organisations and | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>individuals.</p> <p>The direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability of proposed allocations. The Masterplan process for Killingworth Moor will guide the development in an appropriate way and will be informed by the expert advice of organisations and individuals.</p> | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | <p>Site 22 to 26: 5) Bats At dusk and dark both walking up between the hedgerows of our farm road and in our garden Bats are clearly visible flying around the area, again the Bat is a protected species and any alterations to the area either on our surrounding the Killingworth Moor site will have a direct effect on the Bats natural habitat. . Previous Planning Declined .</p> | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. This includes careful consideration of all species identified through this representation. The importance of local wildlife is recognised through a range of proposed policies, including through the incorporation of wildlife corridors into the development. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Key to this is the need to proactively plan for the protection and enhancement of wildlife habitats, including for the species identified, something which will be informed by the</p> | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | expert advice of organisations and individuals. The direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability of proposed allocations. The Masterplan process for Killingworth Moor will guide the development in an appropriate way and will be informed by the expert advice of organisations and individuals. | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 6) Holystone Cottage Swimming Pool In 2003 the previous owners of our property applied for planning for a building containing a swimming pool and planning was refused by North Tyneside Council under their reference note 03/03688/FUL with the planning officers report summarising that an enclosure measuring 17.8m long by 6.52m wide would in the planning officers written word "create an overbearing, dominant and obtrusive feature, within safeguarded land when particularly viewed from the east and north of the site. This is especially significant given there is a public footpath which runs directly adjacent to the east boundary wall of the proposal. It is therefore considered that the proposal by virtue of its position, size and massing will not preserve the open nature of the area and will cause significant visual intrusion within the safeguarded land". We therefore assume that the "open | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Comment noted with regard to previous proposal for development. At that time applications for development will have been considered based upon the policy set out within the Unitary Development plan. This process seeks to review the overall strategy for the Borough to ensure the sustainability and development needs of the Borough can continue to be met for the next fifteen years. It should also be noted that even following allocation, a planning application(s) for the proposed strategic site will require approval before any development can commence. Such an application will be judged on merit through the development management process. However it must be appreciated that a view is not a material planning consideration. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | nature of the area" will be maintained following the conclusion of the councils own development plan and that the councils own planning officer's written word will be adhered to and no significant visual intrusions will be permitted within the safeguarded land, be it roads, houses or factories. . | | | | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 7) Holystone Farm 2014 In 2014 Holystone Farm was declined planning permission from North Tyneside Council due to various reasons on the planning officer's report, one of which referenced the risk of underground gasses from the redundant Holystone coal mine. . We therefore assume that the planning officer's restrictions apply across the whole are of the old Holystone coal mine and that the same planning restrictions apply though out. . | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Comment noted with regard to previous proposal for development. Even following allocation, a planning application(s) for the proposed strategic site will require approval before any development can commence. Such an application will be judged on merit through the development management process. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to former mining uses and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | No amendments proposed |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: Ancient Monuments . 8) The Holystone The Holystone itself which is what our village is named after, it is in the direct vicinity of our property and is designated as an ancient monument. The Northumberland Estates Vision Statement for the Representations to the North Tyneside Local Plan; Consultation shows a building directly over the site of the Holystone. Although North Tyneside Council have | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. The Holystone is not a designated ancient monument, nor does it have any other heritage designations, therefore it would be classed as a non-designated heritage asset. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | not issued a master plan for the area, hopefully none will be required after reading this document, but for certain a building cannot be considered anywhere in the vicinity of the Holystone. . | | | impacts and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 9) Killingworth Wagonway The Killingworth Wagonway which runs through Killingworth Moor down to the A19 Corridor and up to the metro line is also an ancient monument. The Councils consultation document references that this should be retained as a public footpath and cycleway as it is an ancient monument yet the suggested sites for development map clearly shows "priority transport improvements" in the guise of a road running from the flyover below the A19 and directly across the same wagonway, how can it be maintained and protected and yet have a road run straight across it. . | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. The Wagonway is not a designated ancient monument, nor does it have any other heritage designations, therefore it would be classed as a non-designated heritage asset. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of impacts and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: The Land . 10) Illegal Draining of the Ponds Just before Easter 2013 I attempted to contact North Tyneside Council's environmental officer as the land managers of Killingworth Moor/A19 Corridor turned up with machinery and drained an established pond on the site. From information which we were provided this pond was established for | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale, something which will take into account environmental constraints. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | in excess of 50 years and over the 5 years we had lived at the property these were home to Ducks, Swans and Heron which were visible from our property. For over six weeks I emailed, rang and left messages every other day and eventually received a call back from a water ways officer saying that the environmental officer was on maternity leave. The waterways officer met me on site and said that although a landowner had a responsibility to drain his land he would investigate with regards to whether the correct permits were in place from Natural England and come back to me, he never did come back to me. I therefore contacted Natural England myself and discovered that no such permits had been requested and they reported this to the Police Wildlife Officer Don Churchill to investigate, we are not aware of the outcome of this investigation. . | | | Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. As part of the Local Plan process the Council is actively working with statutory bodies such as Natural England and the Environment Agency to determine whether proposals for development are appropriate. | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 11) Declined Permit to Plough (Environmental Impact Survey) In June 2014 a contractor again turned up to Killingworth Moor/A19 corridor and commenced the installation of field drainage across the land. When I asked him what he was doing he replied that he had been employed by Northumberland Estates to install land drainage to prevent the pond from refilling and to drain the two other ponds and remainder of the land into | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale, something which will take into account environmental constraints. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>the Briardene in order that the field could be ploughed. We then contacted Dr Dave Mitchell, Lead Adviser, Protected Sites: Regulation & Enforcement Delivery Team of Natural England to ascertain whether the relevant permits and permissions were in place, they were not. . Natural England then declined the landowners request for a ploughing permit as it was designated a “semi-natural” area of habitat and the proposed ploughing works would be likely to have a significant effect on the environment due to likely impacts on semi-natural habitats, protected. The applicant (landowner) was asked to submit an Environmental Statement with a full assessment of the impacts of the proposal on the environmental features before and consent by Natural England, which we believe has not been issued as yet. The applicant was advised that no works should take place without such a consent we have checked this week prior to writing and to date no such statement or assessment has been submitted to Natural England.</p> | | | <p>matters and the overall suitability of the site. As part of the Local Plan process the Council is actively working with statutory bodies such as Natural England and the Environment Agency to determine whether proposals for development are appropriate.</p> | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | <p>Site 22 to 26: Coal Mining Shafts Killingworth Moor/A19 Corridor is the former site of the Holystone coal mine and according to the latest document published by the Coal Authority on the 11th June 2014 titled “North Tyneside: coal mining risk area plan” the area</p> | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>Comment noted with regard to previous proposal for development. Even following allocation, a planning application(s) for the proposed strategic site will require approval before any development can commence. Such an application will be judged on merit through the development management</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>listed as Holystone Farm and Killingworth Moor is designated as a "Development High Risk Area". Having spoken to the Coal Authority last week it appears that their legal protocol has not been adhered too as the area in question is designated as a mining referral site, therefore a mining risk assessment should be collated along with the Coal Authority. It appears that Northumberland Estates have not requested or issued such documentation for last year's deep excavation for field drainage, nor have North Tyneside Council or any other entities issued any documentation, permits or permissions to the Coal Authority for this area. Any ground works / development within the vicinity of Killingworth Moor/A19 Corridor poses a serious risk of ground destabilisation and has a potential to cause unsettling of our property and surrounding buildings, we are currently awaiting an inspection from a structural engineer on our property for cracking of the external walls which have appeared since these works were carried out, if the council did issue such permits can it confirm that unsettling to our property was taken into consideration as well as the risk of unsettling to our 2000ltr buried LPG Tank and buried septic tank both of which have encountered significant movement since the works were</p> | | | <p>process. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues relating to former mining uses and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. As part of the Local Plan and development management processes the Council is actively working with the Coal Authority to determine whether proposals for development are appropriate.</p> | <p>shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | undertaken. | | | | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 13) Surface Water Drainage (From our property and the Farm) into the Briardene The surface and rainwater drainage from Holystone Farm and our property (Holystone Cottage) runs directly across the Killingworth Moor/A19 corridor site and joins the Briardene, the plans for this area would undoubtedly have a direct impact on the provision of this drainage and should be considered as an interruption to this supply is unacceptable. . | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to drainage, including flood risk. At this stage an inition Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken and is available online. Any application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of drainage and flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. As part of the Local Plan and development management processes the Council is actively working with the Environment Agency and Northumbrian Water to determine whether proposals for development are appropriate. | No amendments proposed |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 14) Main Gas Infrastructure The Killingworth Moor/A19 Corridor site adjacent to our property has a high pressure gas infrastructure main running directly up the length of the field, as well as the consideration for this as part of any potential development last year's deep excavation and unsettling of the land should be given serious consideration as to its current condition and the risk that any damage to it could have on surrounding properties such as ours. . | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A geotechnical survey has been carried out providing an initial assessment of ground constraints and conditions. Further work would be considered through the ongoing masterplan procedd. Any application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of issues related to utilities and infrastructure provision and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. As part of the Local Plan and development management processes the Council is actively working | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | with the major utilities and infrastructure providers to determine whether proposals for development are appropriate. | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 15) Electrical Overhead Lines (Transformer feeding our property and the Farm) The Killingworth Wagonway which runs adjacent to our property has a three phase main power supply which runs along it and is the main power supply to both the Farm and our property, this is fed from a transformer positioned at the junction of the public footpath which runs down the side of our property and the Wagonway, the electrical supplies then go underground to our property and the farm. . This transformer, power lines and supports are directly inline of what is listed as priority transport improvements coming below the A19 underpass onto Killingworth Moor and would therefore require relocated should any development happen, it should be noted that any interruption to our power supply would be unacceptable. . | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale, something which will take into account the location of overhead wires. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. As part of the Local Plan process the Council is actively working with the National Grid to determine whether proposals for development are appropriate. | No amendments proposed |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: The Roads . 16) Killingworth Way A1056 (Already Oversubscribed) The A1056 leading to Killingworth from the A19 slip road is already hugely oversubscribed, coming off this junction at peak traffic times encounters a long wait and the potential introduction of 2000 houses to Killingworth Moor will make this | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes the careful consideration of the most appropriate means of access from the existing network. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | situation worse, even though the slip road appears that it may come under a potential traffic improvement we cannot see how the possible injection of more vehicles even with improvements to this slip road can be of any benefit to the already frustrated residents of Killingworth and the surrounding villages. A191 Whitley Road & Holystone Bypass . | | | transport issues and constraints. Importantly, the impacts upon the existing road network, including the A19, A191, A188, Great Lime Road and A1056, will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. In addition, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This also includes working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 17) Great Lime Road A188 (Already Oversubscribed) As detailed above the A188 is also hugely oversubscribed, The Holystone Bypass and A191 Whitley Road are also oversubscribed so the introduction of 2000 houses to the area at peak traffic times will have a seriously detrimental effect on the traffic and add to the already frustrated residents of Holystone and the surrounding villages. . | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A series of traffic modelling studies have been undertaken and will continue to be developed to fully understand the impacts of development upon the road network and required mitigations. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes the careful consideration of the most appropriate means of access from the existing network. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, the impacts upon the existing road network, including the A19, A191, A188, Great Lime Road and A1056, will be carefully considered with mitigation | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. In addition, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This also includes working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 18) Priority Transport Improvements (Consultation 2015) As detailed above we cannot see how adding 2000 houses into an area with oversubscribed roads will be of any benefit to local residents. The priority transport improvements shown on the suggested sites for development map indicating link roads from the A1056 to the A188 will do nothing to improve local oversubscribed roads, we see it as merely access to the potential mixed residential and commercial site of Killingworth Moor/A19 Corridor. . | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A series of traffic modelling studies have been undertaken and will continue to be developed to fully understand the impacts of development upon the road network and required mitigations. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes the careful consideration of the most appropriate means of access from the existing network. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, the impacts upon the existing road network, including the A19, A191, A188, Great Lime Road and A1056, will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. In addition, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This also includes working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 19) Priority Transport Improvements (Consultation 2015) Noise to our Property The priority transport improvements particularly across Killingworth Moor/A19 Corridor will have a direct impact both from a visual and noise perspective to our property which we believe from a planning perspective are unacceptable. | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | All proposals in addition to ensuring they adequately mitigate or make positive contributions to the borough as a whole will also be required to ensure that the residential amenity of new and existing residents are protected. This would include ensuring issues such as noise pollution, and air quality are properly considered and mitigated where they arise. Such assessments can be pre-empted to some degree through design of schemes but the key stage for undertaking noise impact assessment and air quality impact assessments will be as detailed proposals for the specific route and design of infrastructure such as new roads are developed. | No amendments proposed |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: The Consultation Plan . 20) Greenfield & Brownfield Sites The plan mentions that 65 Brownfield sites have been identified for development, however it does not identify on the suggested sites for development map any of these 65 Brownfield sites, surely these should be categorised as preferential rather than effecting Greenfield sites, is there a new plan indicating where these 65 Brownfield sites are as it appears that a lot of | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | All of the suggested sites for development are identified on the map, whether brownfield or greenfield. Further detail on the specific size, yield and whether the sites is greenfield or brownfield in nature is available in Policy S7.3 (now Policy S4.3), setting out the detail of every site identified as a suggested housing site. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | them have been removed from the 2015 plan. . | | | potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: 21) Factory's and Commercial Units The site of Killingworth Moor appears to have a potential mix of residential and commercial employment areas, in fact we have seen Northumberland Estates proposal for nine factory units, hotel and offices in the field directly behind and alongside our property, have the council considered the number of vacant factory units all around the neighbouring area such as Benton Square Industrial Estate, Bellway Industrial Estate, The Cobalt etc, why build new factory's on Greenbelt land when there are tens of thousands of square feet of empty units all around the area, The Cobalt Park website today shows fifteen vacant factory/offices and a future three becoming vacant. | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The proposal for the strategic site at Killingworth Moor includes the potential delivery of up to 2,000 homes and up to 17ha of employment land. The Employment Land Review provides the evidence for the amount of land required to meet the economic growth and development needs of the borough over the plan period. Despite there being empty premises across the borough the analysis of need has considered that further land will be needed, in addition to this, over the next 15 years and it is considered that the strategic site at Killingworth Moor can help meet some of this need by providing land for employment development in a sustainable and accessible location. | No amendments proposed. |
| 892986 | | RESIDENT | LP2015307 | Site 22 to 26: In summary we are very disappointed with the plan and how it will impact on the Killingworth and Holystone Areas, to our knowledge the previous council's approach was to | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Objection to development noted due to the wide range of reasons highlighted through this representation. In addition to the ongoing Local Plan process, further engagement on the detailed proposals will | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | maintain the individuality of the villages and it now appears that the Councils intention is that they are to be joined together creating one large housing and commercial space. . The plan has a significant impact directly to our family home and our way of living and will also drive the value of our property down significantly, bearing this all in mind it is without hesitation that we shall be using our best endeavours to safeguard our family home, quiet lifestyle and its natural wildlife filled surroundings. | | | be undertaken as proposals are firmed up during detailed masterplanning and any future planning application. | the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 893594 | | RESIDENT | LP2015337 | Murton Village: it is important that all bridle paths in the vicinity be preserved. The roads into and out of the village need substantial improvements. These roads were constructed initially for farm traffic (mainly in the days of horse and cart traffic). The construction is not coping well with modern traffic usage, mainly HGV and buses. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure, with emphasis placed on protecting and improving bridlepaths and PROWs. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | |
| 894604 | | RESIDENT | LP2015411 | Priority Transport Improvements I have shown on the enclosed plan the proposed TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENT ROAD moved to the east of the A19 and shown in blue for two very important and valid reasons. 1. There is a major accident black spot at the junction of the B1322 and the A1056 Seghill, Backworth, Killingworth junction. Providing a roundabout at this junction would virtually eliminate major accidents and could provide an easier junction for traffic leaving the A19 southbound. 2. There would be a major benefit to Backworth Village as the relocation of this route to the east of the A19 would provide a very much needed by-pass to Backworth Village without a great cost. As you will be aware the road through Backworth Village is very narrow and not at all designed to cope with the excessively | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The suggested changes to the local highway network, show on the attached plan, are noted. it should be recognised that planning permission has been granted for development to the east of the A19 that is expected to incorporate a minor between the B1322, B1317 and the A186. At the Killingworth Moor suggested site comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. A crucial aspect of this will be the need for an access and transport strategy which will identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes the most appropriate means of | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>heavy volume of very large lorries that use this road as a shortcut to Silverlink and Cobalt. The large lorries are so close to the pavement and indeed on many occasions the wing mirrors of these lorries actually project over the kerbs and so close to children walking to school - something must be done before there is a fatality. (Representation also logged against Policy S10.3)</p> | | | <p>access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network, such as the B1322, A1056 and A19. The routes as shown on the Policies Map are indicative, only being a reflection of the earliest discussions as to how some of the identified issues might be resolved. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with the Murton site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. In addition to this, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3) and the IDP for further detail.</p> | |
| 588278 | | RESIDENT | LP2015421 | <p>The references to Building for Life and Design Review are welcome but the Policy needs to be much more robust in imposing these as requirements. There is no mention of other relevant housing criteria such as HAPPI 2 etc or about the need for better space standards (RIBA Space Light campaign for the Housing Standards Review)</p> | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The Local Plan includes a range of policies to deliver new development which is attractively designed, including Policy DM9.2 (now Policy DM6.2). A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. Development as part of the strategic sites will be required to meet the sustainability and design standards as set out in the Build Environment section of</p> | <p>A new policy introducing technical housing standards - in accordance with national guidance has been added to the Local Plan.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>the Local Plan.</p> <p>Policies should reflect the latest accepted standards and the need to update Policy DM9.2 (now DM6.2) will be considered.</p> <p>In addition since this last Consultation Draft the governments approach to applying local standards for development through planning has changed. New national planning guidance on Housing technical standards and revisions to building regulations now provide a route for the Council to introduce minimal space standards, improved accessibility and water efficiency. Evidence has been developed considering the needs for these across the whole of North Tyneside and appropriate policy included in the pre-submission draft of the plan.</p> | |
| 894788 | | | LP2015449 | <p>I refer to Killingworth Village and Killingworth Moor. I moved to Killingworth Village in 1972 and saw it become a conservation area. I also saw the "Killingworth Open Break" established as part of the UDP. The former authority, Northumberland County Council, were keen to maintain road separation between the 'new town' and the Village, for the benefit of that environment. THE INCLUSION IN THE PLAN OF THE WESTERN SPUR OF 'PRIORITY TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING NEW LINK ROADS' IS CONTRARY TO THAT AMBITION, AND SHOULD BE DELETED (any new development should primarily access the north/south 'new</p> | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>Through development of the Concept Plan a range of matters have been considered including the role and impact of new transport provision to and through the sites. At Killingworth the importance of protecting the character of the village has been one of the main considerations of the approach taken. The Concept Plan included within the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan aims to achieve this and does not indicate a priority link to the west. On the contrary the option exists to significantly downgrade road access into Killingworth Village, safeguarding the character of the village and avoiding capacity constraints at the junction of Killingworth Road with Great Lime Road. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>link road'). Additionally, you will see that the south east boundary of the Conservation Area is an arc. This arose because of a plan at that time to build a bypass to the Killingworth Arms junction along that arc. That junction presently remains somewhat dangerous for road users. THE PLAN SHOULD INCLUDE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SOUTH EAST BYPASS OF THE KILLINGWORTH ARMS JUNCTION AS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED (this would also introduce traffic calming benefits in Killingworth Village). This proposal should be implemented at an early date.</p> | | | <p>prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. Killingworth Open Break is set out in adopted UDP policy and this is carried forward into the Local Plan in Policy S3.5 (now Policy S1.9), as part of Local Green Space.</p> <p>A crucial aspect of this will be the need for an access and transport strategy which will identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. The routes as shown on the Policies Map are indicative, only being a reflection of the earliest discussions as to how some of the identified issues might be resolved. However, only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The Masterplan and the strategic allocations policy will ensure that road infrastructure improvements are delivered at the right time.</p> <p>In addition to this, a wide range of road and</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. | |
| 806166 | | RESIDENT | LP2015481 | Sites 34-41 I am writing to object strongly to the North Tyneside Local Plan for the following reasons: "c Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate and contrary to planning policy. For example sites 35-41 is to provide ecological compensation for a development elsewhere in the borough. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The proposed mitigation site referred to relates to the deliverability of homes at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). This mitigation must be introduced in order for development of that site to commence. At this time a number of alternative options are available and being considered for the required mitigation with an objective that in also mitigating potential development at Murton Gap a more effective and larger area of land will be made available at a location that can be safeguarded for its wildlife value on a permanent basis. | No amendments proposed. |
| 895164 | | | LP2015493 | I oppose the plan in its current form for two main reasons. The first one is clear to any casual observer - the traffic chaos this will bring to Whitley Bay. The arterial roads into Whitley Bay: Rake Lane, Billy Mill Lane, Norham Road, Middle Engine Lane, Earsdon Road - Shiremoor to West Monkseaton, Park Lane - Shiremoor, and Beach Road - Tynemouth are at saturation point currently. The danger to residents from this has already been recognised by NTC in the many traffic management and road calming measures in place. How then can NTC possibly justify adding vast numbers of | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>houses slap, bang in the middle of this chaotic road network to simply add to the current problem? A new trunk road between Rake Lane and Earsdon Road will not alleviate any of this - it will just add make it worse - anyone can see that. I can only imagine how many cars will come from the 4000 proposed houses.....how will the roads cope, and at what expense in terms of traffic hazards this will bring to the residents? The second reason I oppose the plan is because of the loss of open green field sites and habitat for wildlife. You just need to look at the West Park development at West Monkseaton - open space and views lost forever, animals, birds and pond-life displaced through loss of habitat despite the promises and reassurances from NTC and Taylor Wimpey that this would never happen.....just go and see for yourself. The glossy site plan and the written assurances from NTC in 2010 promised to protect the wildlife and the environment but they didn't deliver and now five years on it's too late. NTC and their friends can not be trusted - if they really had the interests of the residents and environment at heart they would be looking elsewhere to fill the apparent housing shortfall. Why decimate what is left of the open spaces in an over-crowded and over-stretched corner of the borough? The plan is illogical, unjustifiable, and unfair</p> | | | <p>necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. The routes as shown on the Policies Map are indicative, only being a reflection of the earliest discussions as to how some of the identified issues might be resolved. However, only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. In addition, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park. Emphasis will also be placed on achieving a modal shift to public transport and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links, including considering options for additional Metro stations. The Masterplan will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | and I will let my vote count in May. | | | networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 895340 | | RESIDENT | LP2015527 | 3) Proposed New York Roundabout to Earsdon Priority Transport Improvement This isn't just a link improvement "" it's a whole new major road which will be duplicated by the proposed Metro improvement! "ç A through route across the Metro would be a major N/S route attracting a lot of traffic. (Think how much already travels along Norham Road which would be yet further increased.) "ç No reference has been made in the householder consultation to the proposed Metro extension from Earsdon Junction (Shiremoor) and Percy Main. The proposed new road | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The LPCD 2015 Summary Document for sets out the basic information regarding Local Plan, highlighting key proposals and levels of grow, and directs residents to the full version for more detail. The map provided in this leaflet highlights the suggested sites for development and some of the key environmental constraints in the borough as, at such a scale, it would impractical to reproduce the entire Policies Map. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>essentially duplicates the proposed extension and will be much less environmentally friendly. Omission of this proposal is likely to skew people's response to this consultation making inclusion of this transport improvement priority unsafe. "ç The new road is vastly more than is needed to serve the proposed Murton development site. Viz it is going to be a major through route to the A186. "ç Such a major road makes a mockery of protecting Murton. Such a road is going to be wide, busy, noisy and well lit (light pollution). "ç A road across the Metro would necessitate a substantial bridge. Given the topography of the land, such a construction, after allowing for Metro clearance and street lights, would be a vertical eyesore. Think of the vertical intrusiveness of Northumberland Park's multi-storey car park which can be seen for miles around! "ç Building the road from north of the Metro to south of the A186 at Earsdon would o violate the sanctity of the green belt. o completely pre-empt any arguments for retaining the green belt here post 2030. "ç North of the Metro, the proposed road runs parallel for its entire length to Earsdon. o This is not wildlife friendly. Nor is it pedestrian, canine or equine friendly as referenced in (5) below. o Placement of the road would segregate the wildlife corridor</p> | | | <p>transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Together the proposals for road and public transport infrastructure improvements are complimentary. The former includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. The routes as shown on the Policies Map are indicative, only being a reflection of the earliest discussions as to how some of the identified issues might be resolved. Importantly, the most appropriate route of the proposed new link road and the impact which this will have upon the environment, including the Green Belt, will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. The crossing of the Metro and pollution impacts will be key aspects of this. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> <p>In addition, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed,</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>from Wellfield playing fields. This is not sensible "" contiguous must be better! It would also being close proximity to the Wellfield schools. This is clearly undesirable on noise and vehicle pollution grounds. ACTION 1: The Priority Transport Improvement link should NOT cross the Metro. Only non-motor access should be planned across the tracks (as already exists). ACTION 2: No mad should be built north of the Metro line to the A 186 at Earsdon ACTION 3: The proposed Murton development area could be satisfactorily accessed through extension of existing routes from West Monkseaton (Dickies Holme, Cauldwell Avenue, Fairfield Drive, Glendale Avenue, Millfield Avenue as well as more major access from Rake Lane, looping through to New York Road. Hence no Priority Transport Improvement would be needed north of the New York roundabout.</p> | | | <p>or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park.</p> <p>The emphasis on achieving a modal shift to public transport is considered an integral part of the Local Plan and the Council is working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links, including considering options for additional Metro stations. Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) highlights the potential Metro extension from Northumberland Park to Percy Main/Howdon (Cobalt Corridor) and this route is shown on the Policies Map as a safeguarded route.</p> | |
| 895340 | | RESIDENT | LP2015528 | <p>4) Scope of Murton Development Site Dickies Holme is a derelict and unloved strip of land adjacent to the Metro leading from West Monkseaton station. "ç For some unexplained reason Dickies Holm has been omitted from the development plan. "ç It would make ideal access to the NE corner of the site "ç Traffic light access to Earsdon Road could easily be incorporated into the pelican lights at West Monkseaton Metro so making a</p> | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The Dickie's Holm site is included within the boundary of the strategic site being considered through the Masterplan. Initial work identifies that this could be used as an access point, albeit only for pedestrians due to significant safety concerns and site constraints, notably related to flood risk. Opportunities to incorporate open space, landscaping and community uses, including allotments, will be explored on a site-specific basis, taking account of the latest evidence of need.</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>safe entrance and exit albeit in close proximity to the bridge. "ç Not using it for a purpose would be wasteful</p> <p>ACTION 1: Dickies Holme is included in the Murton development area, primarily for access to part of the site. Close inspection of the plan seems to exclude the strip of land adjacent to the Shiremoor allotments and the course of the old A186. "ç This strip of land has a dual footpath as a result of being the former roadway. This is unnecessary. ACTION 2: Could the allotments be enlarged so as to make productive use of this land? Presumably with increased housing, demand for allotments will not decrease?</p> | | | | of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 895341 | | RESIDENT | LP2015534 | <p>4) Scope of Murton Development Site Dickies Holme is a derelict and unloved strip of land adjacent to the Metro leading from West Monkseaton station. "ç For some unexplained reason Dickies Holm has been omitted from the development plan. "ç It would make ideal access to the NE corner of the site "ç Traffic light access to Earsdon Road could easily be incorporated into the pelican lights at West Monkseaton Metro so making a safe entrance and exit albeit in close proximity to the bridge. "ç Not using it for a purpose would be wasteful</p> <p>ACTION 1: Dickies Holme is included in the Murton development area, primarily for access to part of the site.</p> | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The Dickie's Holm site is included within the boundary of the strategic site being considered through the Masterplan. Initial work identifies that this could be used as an access point, albeit only for pedestrians due to significant safety concerns and site constraints, notably related to flood risk. Opportunities to incorporate open space, landscaping and community uses, including allotments, will be explored on a site-specific basis, taking account of the latest evidence of need.</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | Close inspection of the plan seems to exclude the strip of land adjacent to the Shiremoor allotments and the course of the old A186. "ç This strip of land has a dual footpath as a result of being the former roadway. This is unnecessary. ACTION 2: Could the allotments be enlarged so as to make productive use of this land? Presumably with increased housing, demand for allotments will not decrease? | | | | |
| 895341 | | RESIDENT | LP2015533 | 3) Proposed New York Roundabout to Earsdon Priority Transport Improvement This isn't just a link improvement "" it's a whole new major road which will be duplicated by the proposed Metro improvement! "ç A through route across the Metro would be a major N/S route attracting a lot of traffic. (Think how much already travels along Norham Road which would be yet further increased.) "ç No reference has been made in the householder consultation to the proposed Metro extension from Earsdon Junction (Shiremoor) and Percy Main. The proposed new road essentially duplicates the proposed extension and will be much less environmentally friendly. Omission of this proposal is likely to skew people's response to this consultation making inclusion of this transport improvement priority unsafe. "ç The new road is vastly more than is needed | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The LPCD 2015 Summary Document for sets out the basic information regarding Local Plan, highlighting key proposals and levels of grow, and directs residents to the full version for more detail. The map provided in this leaflet highlights the suggested sites for development and some of the key environmental constraints in the borough as, at such a scale, it would impractical to reproduce the entire Policies Map. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Together the proposals for road and public transport infrastructure | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>to serve the proposed Murton development site. Viz it is going to be a major through route to the A186. "ç Such a major road makes a mockery of protecting Murton. Such a road is going to be wide, busy, noisy and well lit (light pollution). "ç A road across the Metro would necessitate a substantial bridge. Given the topography of the land, such a construction, after allowing for Metro clearance and street lights, would be a vertical eyesore. Think of the vertical intrusiveness of Northumberland Park's multi-storey car park which can be seen for miles around! "ç Building the road from north of the Metro to south of the A186 at Earsdon would o violate the sanctity of the green belt. o completely pre-empt any arguments for retaining the green belt here post 2030. "ç North of the Metro, the proposed road runs parallel for its entire length to Earsdon. o This is not wildlife friendly. Nor is it pedestrian, canine or equine friendly as referenced in (5) below. o Placement of the road would segregate the wildlife corridor from Wellfield playing fields. This is not sensible "" contiguous must be better! It would also being close proximity to the Wellfield schools. This is clearly undesirable on noise and vehicle pollution grounds. ACTION 1: The Priority Transport Improvement link should NOT cross the Metro. Only non-</p> | | | <p>improvements are complimentary. The former includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. The routes as shown on the Policies Map are indicative, only being a reflection of the earliest discussions as to how some of the identified issues might be resolved. Importantly, the most appropriate route of the proposed new link road and the impact which this will have upon the environment, including the Green Belt, will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. The crossing of the Metro and pollution impacts will be key aspects of this. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> <p>In addition, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park.</p> <p>The emphasis on achieving a modal shift to public transport is considered an integral</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | motor access should be planned across the tracks (as already exists). ACTION 2: No mad should be built north of the Metro line to the A 186 at Earsdon ACTION 3: The proposed Murton development area could be satisfactorily accessed through extension of existing routes from West Monkseaton (Dickies Holme, Cauldwell Avenue, Fairfield Drive, Glendale Avenue, Millfield Avenue as well as more major access from Rake Lane, looping through to New York Road. Hence no Priority Transport Improvement would be needed north of the New York roundabout. | | | part of the Local Plan and the Council is working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links, including considering options for additional Metro stations. Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) highlights the potential Metro extension from Northumberland Park to Percy Main/Howdon (Cobalt Corridor) and this route is shown on the Policies Map as a safeguarded route. | |
| 895349 | | RESIDENT | LP2015551 | Murton: My and my neighbour's main concern (selfishly) is what is going to happen to Cauldwell Avenue in terms of access to this new housing? We are hoping our road is not going to be opened up as a through road... at present Cauldwell Ave is heavy with traffic because of doctor surgery/school traffic and the road is too narrow and restricting to cope with more traffic. My concerns may not be important to concern future development but they are important to myself and my neighbours! | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This involves assessing the most appropriate means of access to the site and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network, including Cauldwell Lane. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. At this time no road access is proposed in the Concept Plan included in the Local Plan to Cauldwell Lane. Indeed a key priority for transport solutions is to ensure there is no detrimental impacts upon the volume of traffic at Seatonville Road. Access via Cauldwell Lane would conflict with this objective. | |
| 798722 | | | LP2015577 | The proposal of 3000 new homes at Murton rather than 5000 is still far in excess of what will actually be required. There is one road in/out of Murton Village. Are you proposing a new road - perhaps the one you asked us to object to in 2012? The loss of green land, the wildlife, the very wild nature of the area would be lost irretrievably. Has this land had a 'health check' regarding flooding risks? 'Must try harder'. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need and identify a requirement for the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development and it has been determined that the strategic site at Murton is required to meet some of the identified need. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity, including that of Murton village.</p> <p>A crucial aspect of this will be the need for an access and transport strategy which will identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. The routes as shown on the Policies Map are indicative, only being a reflection of the earliest discussions as to how some of the identified issues might be resolved. However, only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable.</p> <p>The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 897221 | | RESIDENT | LP2015592 | <p>North Tyneside has a long-standing tradition of horse related leisure. At the heart of the development site is Murton equestrian centre and there are the few remaining livery yards at Earsdon and Backworth. Having personally lost stabling twice through development I would like local authorities to aim to preserve opportunities for residents to gain access to outdoor pursuits. These may be simple everyday activities such as, dog walking, running, leisure cycling, horse riding or simply enjoying open country areas, but residents' access to open areas require vital protection and consideration.</p> | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. In this the importance of networks for horse riding, walking and cycling are recognised and with the needs being fully integrated into the Masterplan process. Proposals also include a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity, including that of Murton village.</p> <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 804813 | | | LP2015632 | <p>We are very concerned that the amount of suggested housing around Murton will take up a large part of the open space there at present. On the map, this area is left white, which means it is hard to see clearly the extent of the loss of green or open space, and how far the proposed housing would contribute to a solid mass of built-up area. The buffer zone is so small as to be negligible. Since 'blocks' of green or park land are marked for housing, the whole area of North Tyneside will, in effect, be densely covered in housing for which other amenities will have to be built. The gaps in building which you say are to 'protect the identity' of various communities are so small as to be pointless.</p> | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity, including that of Murton village. At the current time, the exact location of land which would be used for developed is yet to be determined, with the Masterplan process providing further clarity once work is more advanced.</p> <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 808139 | | RESIDENT | LP2015646 | Murton: Access to this development is to be by a new large link road to the west of the development which will have to be raised to cross the Metro line, thereby creating a barrier and causing other problems by increasing the amount of traffic not to mention noise. Other access roads will have to be constructed capable of accommodating the public transport and the increased volume of road transport associated with a large housing development. The existing roads in the New York / Murton area are totally unsuitable for access to this development, being constructed originally, nearly a century ago. The utility companies have several services underneath this stretch of road. New York is also used as a rat run by drivers trying to bypass the Billy Mill roundabout and the Norham Road North roundabout. Approximately 150 public omnibuses of various sizes navigate the village weekly so at times the main road can be difficult to manoeuvre. Over the years we have had severe flooding problems on these roads after heavy rainfall though this | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Together the proposals for road and public transport infrastructure improvements are complimentary. The former includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. The routes as shown on the Policies Map are indicative, only being a reflection of the earliest discussions as to how some of the identified issues might be resolved. Importantly, the most appropriate route of the proposed new link road and the impact which this will have upon the environment, including the Green Belt, will be carefully considered with mitigation | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | appears to have been finally corrected after years of trying by Northumbria Police, in July last year when they closed the roads and summoned the council's only gully wagon to clear the drains. The area designated for development slopes to the North/Northeast thereby adding no doubt to the flooding possibilities of West Monkseaton. | | | measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. The crossing of the Metro and impact on the surrounding local road network will be key aspects of this. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 897641 | | RESIDENT | LP2015649 | Secondly the proposed build around the Murton area, I have been informed that this is a protected area for certain species. I am at a loss to understand this, as previously a builder bought all of this land, from Wellfield to Shiremoor/Murton, and planning permission was passed for a huge development, but failed due to road access. One or the other is true, both cannot be. Yet you actually have fields as green belt, when we know that planning permission for houses was passed. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Comment noted with regard to previous proposal for development. Even following allocation, a planning application(s) for the proposed strategic site will require approval before any development can commence. Such an application will be judged on merit through the development management process. | considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015663 | Positively Prepared - yes Justified - yes Effective - yes Consistency to NPPF - yes Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - yes Support - The Coal Authority supports the recognition within criterion h that appropriate remediation and mitigation measures should be agreed to address ground conditions. | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Support for development noted, provided that appropriate remediation and mitigation is undertaken in line with criterion h) of the strategic allocations policy. | No amendments proposed. |
| 897792 | | RESIDENT | LP2015674 | We object to any development around Murton Village. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Objection to development noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP2015678 | I agreed with the comments made [at the Killingworth drop-in session) and suggested to the officers a road could run from Holystone roundabout (A19) on to Killingworth Moor via a road bridge over the Metro line (a road bridge over the metro line is in the plan on the Murton site). This would give traffic direct access from the A19 on to the South East corner of Killingworth Moor. This was suggested in 1996 when the last local plan was under discussion, I attended a consultation meeting held by senior council officers who advocated the road from Holystone roundabout and | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | said only a limited amount of Killingworth Moor could be developed as the smaller supporting road network was limited in traffic capacity. But I accept Killingworth Moor and Murton will have to take some housing development and did not object to the planning applications for housing at the former R.E.M.E. site on Killingworth Moor, the old Norgas House and Stevenson House sites in Killingworth and the old Thermal syndicate site at Palmersville, and the recent Castle Park/Backworth site for 290 houses. | | | scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. Importantly this will include how the site relates to the A19 and Holystone roundabout. The routes as shown on the Policies Map are indicative, only being a reflection of the earliest discussions as to how some of the identified issues might be resolved. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. | |
| 803337 | | RESIDENT | LP2015686 | Though I would have liked to see more open space between Murton/Shiremoor/West Monkseaton I believe that your plans are fair. | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | General support for development noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 807842 | | RESIDENT | LP2015710 | Murton: We acknowledge that the figure of 3,000 is a maximum number but we would very much welcome a substantial reduction in this to protect the identity of not only Murton village | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>but also the area around the Briar Vale Estate, including St Anne's Court - a buffer zone similar to that proposed around Murton. Whatever number of houses are eventually agreed we would expect 25% to be the starting point for the construction of affordable homes. It is absolutely essential that young people should be able to get a foot on the housing ladder in both urban and rural areas. As mention in our letter of 16 December 2013, our main priority with regard to the building of more houses, is the reduction in, or ideally the elimination of, the risk of any future flooding in the briar Vale and St Anne's Court area. We would expect that, in the event of a planning application or applications ever being made to build on the land with a site reference 35 -41 on the Consultation 2015, North East area, the Council would insist on the developer or developers preparing a full flood risk assessment and constructing the necessary drainage and water storage systems additional to those already proposed for this area as set out in the "Reducing the risk of flooding in North Tyneside" quarterly update "February 2015" Map reference 1b.</p> | | | <p>outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. A number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now Policy DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | <p>the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 898166 | | RESIDENT | LP2015712 | <p>Murton: We acknowledge that the figure of 3,000 is a maximum number but we would very much welcome a substantial reduction in this to protect the identity of not only Murton village but also the area around the Briar Vale Estate, including St Anne's Court - a buffer zone similar to that proposed around Murton. Whatever number of houses are eventually agreed we would expect 25% to be the starting point for the construction of affordable homes. It is absolutely essential that young people should be able to get a foot on the housing ladder in both urban and rural areas. As mention in our letter of 16 December 2013, our main priority with regard to the building of more houses, is the reduction in, or ideally the elimination of, the risk of any future flooding in the briar Vale and St Anne's Court area. We would expect that, in the event of a planning application or applications ever being made to build on the land with a site reference 35 -41 on the Consultation 2015, North East area, the Council would insist on the developer or developers preparing a full flood risk assessment and constructing the necessary drainage and water storage systems additional to those already proposed for this area as set out in the "Reducing the risk of flooding in North Tyneside" quarterly update "February 2015" Map</p> | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. A number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now Policy DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | reference 1b. | | | and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. | |
| 898328 | | | LP2015751 | I understand that all councils are under pressure to build and this is leading to building on green spaces. One of the proposals recently put forward to residents was to build on the area behind Monkseaton High School. I, like most residents, rejected this idea because it is a green field space. I strongly believe that that area could be made into a great space with housing and a much needed wooded area. If the council were to guarantee that the company building on the land had to plant acres of trees and create a very green environment around any housing, I am sure it could win over residents. You could relieve congestion on the existing roads with one main road through the middle. There could be cycle routes and walks through the wooded areas to provide a much needed large green space for families to enjoy. Most importantly, there should be an area similar to Jesmond dene or (No Suggestions) park created in this area. We really should be thinking of ways to create new green spaces along side the inevitable house building because one day all of these green spaces will end up being built on; so if we don't start thinking | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) (now Policies DM1.4 and S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | differently soon we'll end up with more urban sprawl and a very ugly region. I hope the council is going to come up with some more positive and realistic suggestions on this matter with quality, environmentally friendly living spaces at their core. I look forward to your reply. Kind Regards, Derek Hall | | | whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. In this the importance of networks for horse riding, walking and cycling are recognised and with the needs being fully integrated into the Masterplan process. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. | |
| 804850 | | | LP2015754 | Any development considered should be along the A19 or A189 corridors as there is ample land from the Tyne Tunnel up as far as Killingworth. Using this land would provide easy access to main trunk roads via new slip roads etc. .It appears bias that there are possibly going to be more houses built on the Murton Gap than at Killingworth, this is grossly unfair. Killingworth is by far the more favourable site as it will have less | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need over the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. The Local Plan Spatial Strategy seeks to maximise development opportunities in Wallsend, North Shields and the Coast, whilst delivering the remaining development needs across the urban area. The resulting distribution of suggested | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>impact for all with its location being on the A19 and A189 Roads around West Monkseaton such as A192 Seatonville/Earsdon Roads, Shields Road around Foxhunters Roundabout are already at maximum capacity and cannot cope with traffic at present. Access to the " Murton Gap" from any of the estate roads such as Fairfield Drive and Cauldwell Avenue must be denied as it is just about impossible to access the A192 at present via these roads. Many roads have been shown with pinch points on the Local plan map, however many places have been missed including the A192 which is one of the busiest and overburdened in the borough. Its as if it is expected all the traffic to head West, it does however also travel North and East. From the consultation map I cannot see how a road bypassing Park Lane Shiremoor can be driven through green belt to the north Murton gap, it somewhat defeats the purpose of a green belt. Once again I can see most of Shiremoor being bypassed and areas such as Monkseaton having to put up with the traffic congestion and road traffic issues such as speeding NOT acceptable! A more suitable idea for existing residents in Monkseaton would be to put the settlement buffer between there and Murton</p> | | | <p>development sites, Policy S7.3 (now Policy S4.3), reflects this strategy, following site-specific assessment in the SHLAA to consider suitability and deliverability/develop ability of each site, before the most sustainable and appropriate allocations are selected. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes, between the two sites, in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible</p> | <p>of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>network of streets. This includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. Importantly in the case of Murton, this includes the A192 and any potential points of access from existing roads. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> <p>In addition, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3) and the IDP for further detail.</p> | |
| 468254 | | RESIDENT | LP2015808 | At the previous consultation we wrote to you on behalf of the Northumberland and Newcastle Society pointing out the three areas in the borough where there is an urgent need to maintain strategic development buffers. In the current consultation two of these have been noted (Killingworth Moor and Murton) but the third ignored. This is the buffer between Benton and Wallsend. We would wish to see the buffer and safeguarded land at Killingworth Moor | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support and improve wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct</p> | Indicative plans for potential development are included within the pre-submission policies map. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | extended both eastwards and westwards to form a much more substantial green area. | | | and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 807743 | | RESIDENT | LP2015840 | As a resident on Briar Vale, West Monkseaton I have 2 major concerns regarding the proposed Murton Development. I urge the council fully consider these over and above any pressures or benefits to building on this site to the volumes proposed. Point 1 - Flooding - the fields from Murton slope towards West Monkseaton, which has caused major flooding to Briar Vale and other housing estates. By building on these fields creates vast areas of non porous surfaces where water currently absorbs into the soil. The fear is that any developer under estimates this issues and the drainage solution isn't effective in heavy persistent periods of precipitation. Point 2 - Traffic Congestion - the current road junction | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site. As part of the Masterplan, an access and | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>linking North Tyneside with the A19 from Rake Lane and the Shiremoor bypass are already heavily congested at peak times. Adding up to a further 3000 homes will just create unbelievable congestion at this junction. Furthermore, I was told at a council meeting that the Foxhunter junction and Seatonville Road were already deemed to be up to capacity. Therefore adding further developments on the Murton site will surely add to these junctions and just make North Tyneside a nightmare to travel around. Whilst it is recognised there is a need for further new housing developments, there needs to be careful consideration on where these big numbers of homes can be placed, so that everyone can enjoy where they live and can freely move around without the risk of their homes being flooded. There are some industrial site in the borough which are largely unused and an eyesore. These appear to have been overlooked for housing, which would probably attract a develop to build the affordable that appears to be lacking.</p> | | | <p>transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. In addition, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to make improvements along the A191 corridor. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>A number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now DM 4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity.</p> | |
| 898589 | | RESIDENT | LP2015845 | <p>I have made a brief examination of the above document and I am pleased to see that some of my concerns expressed in my letter of the 30th December 2013 have been addressed. However, much is still of concern. I note that some attempt has been made to provide details of the necessary infra structure to accommodate the major developments which are proposed. However, no indication is included as to how these requirements are to be funded. In particular the roads proposed to serve the developments on Killingworth Moor/Backworth. In my opinion, such costs should be borne by the Landowner /Developer, otherwise, the local tax payers will be subsidising the profits of the Developer and Land Owner. Piece meal</p> | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | development of several small sites will not provide the relevant sums. One major Development of the area(s) should generate enough profit to allow this to happen. I note that some major traffic improvements are planned at key strategic junctions. I would have thought that duelling the Northern Relief road around the North Side of Killingworth Township would relieve some of the current concerns. It is noted that agreed master plans would be required. Will this be on a site by site basis or will their be an overall master plan for the whole of Killingworth Moor, for instance. An overall master plan for Killingworth Moor is the only way to achieve a unified and consistent development. Of particular concern is Killingworth Lane and Killingworth road, which in their present form will not be able to support the additional traffic generated by the proposed developments on Killingworth Moor. similarly, Killingworth Village will become more of a "rat run" than it currently is. I believe that Killingworth Moor is partly classified as for Employment. Surely the particular area should be specifically identified. | | | development be considered acceptable. The Masterplan will allow for the issues of funding to be tackled at a strategic level, avoiding an risk of a piecemeal approach. The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS), part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, outlines the indicative costs for the infrastructure required to meet the levels of growth anticipated in the Local Plan. The IDS outlines that the funding for the major road works required for both strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, will be met by the developers. | |
| 898591 | | RESIDENT | LP2015847 | The local road infrastructure currently gridlocks regularly at prime times. Despite the proposed new road through Murton the additional vehicles from such a huge development is of | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | serious concern. Has consideration been given to the impact the additional vehicles from this development will cause to the emergency services, particularly the ambulance service to North Tyneside Hospital? | | | the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. This includes the improvements to the A191 corridor and ensuring that there will be no negative impacts on NT General Hospital. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 798830 | | | LP2015938 | I do not disagree that NT needs more housing, but feel that two important issues are being overlooked: appropriateness of housing; and situation. There is constant reference in the Press about the issues facing 'first time buyers'. What provision is there for this within the consultation. WE have seen developments such as West Park which do not help this group of people. Additionally, we have much 'brown field' space which CAN and SHOULD be sued before we start | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need and identify a requirement for the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development. These site will offer the range and type of housing necessary to meet the needs of the whole community, including variables relating to tenure, size and type of homes. As part of this overall number the needs of first-time buyers are a priority. A number of policies are in place to ensure that an | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>carving up what remains of the little green space and countryside within the borough. Much of what has been proposed will be definition need additional work to improve road access, and that in turn will create even more disruption. We want NT to be a place where people choose to live, and can afford to do so. We need to target, and build for, first time buyers. This might not need houses such as those on West Park which are not appropriate for this category. I beseech you to think again; to involve more of the local people. The enormity of ill feeling that the proposals have generated on social media would suggest that you may have been elected to represent us, but that you are not doing so.</p> | | | <p>appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now Policy DM4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity.</p> <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes consideration of the most</p> | <p>exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. | |
| 805083 | | RESIDENT | LP2015945 | Sites 22-26: I am against any development on Killingworth Moor. A pleasant Swath of Countryside separates communities where skylarks and Lapwings breed also other wildlife lives. Good for walking, riding and cycling. | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure, maximising opportunities for walking, riding and cycling. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 805083 | | RESIDENT | LP2015946 | Site 22-26: Parts of this floods in wet weather due to mining subsidence. It would destroy the character of Killingworth. The area should be designated green belt. | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale.</p> <p>The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> <p>Any change to the Green Belt, both addition and deletion, must be proposed through the Local Plan process. In line with NPPF, in order to make such a change exceptional circumstances must be identified. A Green Belt Review has been undertaken to support the Local Plan and this concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to support any change to the current Green Belt boundaries.</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| 898857 | | RESIDENT | LP2015958 | Sites 35-41: I am concerned that the existing flooding risk (we were flooded in 2012) will be worsened. I enjoy walking my dog in the area and will no longer be able to do so. The buffer zone shown on the 2015 Plan looks to be inadequate. The A191 and A192 are already heavily used and the development will increase the traffic congestion. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network, such as the A191 corridor and the A192. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | |
| 898857 | | RESIDENT | LP2015959 | Site 35-41:I am appalled at the way developers have 'run rings" around the Council e.g. the West Park Development. The question regards alterative sites is a loaded one. If I may suggest an alternative- knock down the empty recently built office blocks on the cobalt business park and build there. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Even following allocation, a planning application(s) for any site will require approval before any development can commence. Such an application will be judged on merit through the development management process. This includes for the proposed strategic site at Murton. Land at Cobalt Business Park (NT030) is allocated for employment purposes, reflected in the strategic Policy S5.1 and then AS5.6 (now Policies S2.1 and AS2.6). As a result, this area is generally not considered appropriate for residential development with the preferred focus being on economic and employment growth. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 and S7.1 (now Policies S1.4 and S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. | |
| 467670 | | RESIDENT | LP2015960 | My views are the same as before. The suggested sites are like the curates egg (some bad but some not so bad). Its the Nibbling away at our small bits of green. Squeezing houses on Blackhill avenue between the flats is (a) unfair on the people who live there (b) unfair on the people who play there. Station road building is already going ahead. At what cost to the Wildlife at the Country Park? Yes we need housing but surely not the amount pushed in willy nilly. Affordable housing? Who can afford it? | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need and identify a requirement for the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 and S7.1 (now Policies S1.4 and S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites. Proposals for the Station Rd/Whitley Rd sites are unlikely to include any development of the most northern part of Station Rd (W) and an appropriate buffer will have to be maintained to existing development to safeguard and enhance existing green links in the area. These | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>measures will help to maintain a gap between settlements, support wildlife habitats, prevent any adverse impact on the Rising Sun CP and enable resident access to recreation areas.</p> <p>A number of policies are in place to ensure that an appropriate range and mix of housing is provided over the plan period. Policy DM7.6 (now Policy 4.7) sets out a borough-wide target for at least 25% of new homes to be affordable on every site which meets the identified threshold. In all but the most exceptional cases, affordable housing will need to be provided on-site and will remain affordable in perpetuity. The definition of affordable housing is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> | |
| 898920 | Sustrans | | LP2015982 | <p>Sustrans are concerned that no new National Cycle Network Routes are shown on the Policies Map, even where these have been discussed with the Council and impact on proposed new development [e.g. NCN102 and NCN103]. This contrasts with proposed car routes through the strategic sites which are shown on the plan. We are also concerned that the commitment to connect the sites to Tyne & Wear Metro is not strong enough. We are also concerned at the apparent confusion between pedestrian cycle links and green infrastructure, which are not necessarily linked. Sustrans would be more comfortable with a policy that explicitly requires a bicycle</p> | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does recognise the potential extension of the National Cycle network with accompanying text amended to recognise the potential new national cycle route along the coast road. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan also includes a list of nine cycling schemes that are being developed with a view to exploring opportunities to secure funding for their construction as and when these arise. The majority of these routes focus on specific corridors which give access to employment destinations – e.g. A19 corridor, A1058 Coast Road corridor. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan also references the North Tyneside’s Cycling Strategy, adopted in 2010, and a revised Cycling Strategy is to be developed which will set</p> | <p>A revised version of the policy map seeks to identify potential key cycle routes.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | network to be constructed at 250m mesh density. The walking and cycling links shown across the A19 from the Killingworth Moor site are inadequate. Care should be taken to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists are able to move over or under the A19 at least every 500 metres. An SPD covering sustainable transport may be the best approach. | | | out how a future vision for cycling will be secured in the Borough. This information all helps shape the Local Plan which aims to deliver sustainable development. Policy DM6.11, S10.3 and DM10.4 (now Policies DM3.6, S7.3 and DM7.4) outline the Councils approach to minimise the need to travel and encourage the use of electric cars. The restoration of a ferry service to Norway falls outside the role of the Local Plan but the benefits of this route are referenced in Policy S5.1 (now Policy S2.1). Comments relating to para 10.22 (now para 10.25) are noted but at this time a rail link is not currently considered necessary to support the economic development of the Port of Tyne, however, the possibility that this land may benefit from a new rail link to support freight movement to and from the north bank at some point in the future cannot be totally discounted. | |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP20151042 | Access and transport strategy- Killingworth Way, Great Lime Road, Shiremoor By-pass. - Rake Lane, Earsdon By-pass. (Why was Killingworth lane B 1317 not mentioned ? As new junctions are proposed from the K / Moor S.Site, at present, it is a very busy rat run at peak times as is Simonside Way - East Bailey). North Tyneside Council is spending Â£150million on road infrastructure over the next 5 years. However I am concerned as at present these roads are at full capacity at peak times ! The additional traffic generated | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes consideration of the most appropriate | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>by the proposed 2 strategic sites will cause gridlock from Monkseaton to Longbenton / Gosforth Park area. I would like to propose a dual carriageway By-Pass of Backworth to run from the Grey Horse Pub roundabout (Shiremoor By-pass) to the A1056, A19 intersection. This would stop the rat run through Backworth and divert traffic away from Holystone roundabout. I would also like to propose closing access to Whitley Road and old Holystone village from Holystone roundabout and use the exit to create an access on to the K / Moor S / Site. This direct connection to the A19 is of vital importance, it is essential if K / Moor is to be developed as proposed and would take pressure off the A1056, B1317, B1505 (Great lime Road). A road bridge over the Metro line would be required on K / Moor just as a road bridge over the Metro line is needed on the Murton S.site's single road. I have spoken to many people who think a new junction is proposed on the A19 from one of the proposed K / Moor roads, the reason for this is they do not know at present a public footpath, farmers lane and tunnel exists (which is only 5.4 metres wide x 4.2 metres high) through the embankment of the A19, and leads to a roundabout on the Shiremoor By-Pass. On the N.T.C. L.P. map the latter section of proposed new road from the</p> | | | <p>means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. Importantly this will include how the sites relate to the A19, Holystone roundabout, Great Lime Rd and A1056 and A191 corridors.</p> <p>The suggested route of new links and improvements to the network are noted and will be considered. The routes as shown on the 2015 Policies Map are indicative, only being a reflection of the earliest discussions as to how some of the identified issues might be resolved. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> | <p>detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | tunnel to Shiremoor By-pass is totally obscured, as 'Northumberland park ' is written across the route. Hence people think a new junction on to the A19 is proposed. The tunnel is only 5.4 metres wide, enough for 2 cars to pass, but no room for a pedestrian footpath ! | | | | |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP20151044 | <p>Could we have another open break, wild life corridor between the housing estates that back on to Killingworth Lane (B1317) and the Proposed developments on K / Moor and Holystone. Running from the Seaton Burn waggon way wildlife corridor along the side of the B1317 road to the old R.E.M.E. site which has planning permission for Bellway housing. This would stop the merging of communities and retain a measure of green open space on the upper East side of Killingworth Moor, and fulfil objectives of AS7.4 (d.& e.) Also S8.4, (c, d,) +8.20. - e.g.- " Green infrastructure corridors must be safeguarded through S.S. Allocations. Major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identity, maintaining amenity space and access to the countryside and biodiversity"..</p> <p>"Wildlife corridors allow movement of wildlife between areas of habitat, linking sites and reducing the risk of</p> | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | isolated populations becoming unstable and dying out. Therefore it is important the network of wildlife sites and links between them is maintained and enhanced ". Please note I believe their is evidence that electricity pylon routes are of no use as wildlife corridors. | | | appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As the Masterplan process progresses, firmer proposals for the network of wildlife corridors and, green infrastructure and buffers will be set out. | |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151100 | Green Party These sites contain important wildlife corridors, esp. Murton which is a key corridor linking greenbelt land to the river and coast. It does not seem possible to reconcile a policy requirement to protect and enhance green infrastructure and wildlife corridors with plans for such major developments with all the associated transport infrastructure. Many of these proposals contravene the policy in DM8.2 | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151307 | AS7.4 Strategic Site Allocations The plan to develop a strategic site at Killingworth Moor is supported. This is a broad location for strategic development (NPPF, 157). Killingworth Moor would be a large scale development which will benefit from master planning and coordinated infrastructure provision. Our Client supports the comprehensively development of the site and acknowledges the need for collaborative working between developers and the Local Planning Authority. Clarification is required with regard to the need for the scale of the services and facilities identified in policy AS7.4 specifically, a new secondary school, major additional retail needs, country park provisions. Our client objects to Criterion (a) which | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Support for allocation of Killingworth Moor noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This is being undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including landowners and statutory bodies, including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date. The comments with regard to infrastructure provision and phasing are acknowledged. Further work is required, through the Masterplan process, in order to determine the exact requirements for additional services and facilities and the likely timescales for delivery of different phases of development, with this being considered important ant in order to avoid any threat of | Reflecting these comments and the functional seperation of the site from the wider strategic allocation the boundary of the Killingworth Moor strategic site has been amended to reflect this and a separate allocation created. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>requires "any application for development to be preceded by and be consistent with a master planar€™ . This does not acknowledge that some parts of the sites could come forward in advance of an agreed master plan when they are of a scale which would not prejudice the overall aims and objectives of the strategic development or its implementation. A more flexible approach is required otherwise there is a real possibility that development on this strategic site will not come forward at all within the plan period. Our Client owns land (part of SHLAA site 075x), which is included as part of the identified strategic site, however it is suggested that this site could come forward in advance of the larger strategic site. This small site situated to the northwest of the area with clear boundary's it is approximately 1.13 ha is bounded by A1056 to the north, High Farm to the east with a mature hedge and trees adjacent to the farm access track which forms part of a Waggon way to the south. The site has a capacity for approximately 30 dwellings. This site could come forward in the early part of the plan period and provide much needed housing delivery in North Tyneside. Initial desktop assessment of the site indicates that there are no heritage assets on the site. A preliminary Ecological Assessment is</p> | | | piecemeal development. | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>currently being prepared early findings indicate the site is of low ecological value but further assessment of bats maybe required, no signs of other protected species were evident. Assessments of the impact of nearby land uses including transport routes will inform a noise assessment and potential mitigation measures. Site investigations will establish any potential historical contamination of the site however as the majority of the site has been actively farmed the risk is anticipated to be low. The site lies within Flood Zone 1, with no known or predicted flood risk arising from the site (1 in 1000 years). The management of surface water would form part of a detailed Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy for the site. An access feasibility report is currently being prepared. Our Client has concerns over the wildlife corridor as currently identified (on the proposals map) along the Killingworth Wagonway. Refer to response to proposed policy S8.1 for further information. Our client is keen to work with the Local Planning Authority and would welcome the opportunity to discuss bringing this site forward for development in the early part of the plan period. (7.36) indicates that only a proportion of the two strategic sites at Killingworth and Murton will be required to meet the Borough's needs</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | for residential development to 2031. This statement is inconsistent within the preceding text and policy AS7.4. Indeed policy S7.3 includes for the full potential capacity of the two sites contributing towards the total homes of 8,806 units over the plan period. For the reasons set out in our response to Policy 7.3 the likelihood that the two strategic sites will not be completed within the plan period, undermines the Plans ability to fully to meet the Borough's housing needs creating significant uncertainty on the deliverability of the plan, and therefore requires additional sites to be identified. Reference is made to the housing trajectory, having regard to the above comments the trajectory will need to be reviewed. (7.42) reference should be included to the contribution that windfall development can make towards the housing supply as well as employment land supply. | | | | |
| 899599 | | RESIDENT | LP20151316 | Site 35-41: As a resident of Murton village I am writing to lodge my dismay at these plans. I walk through the fields to the Metro. The reassurance of it being sown and ploughed each year gives a sense of continuity and connection to nature. As stated in the National Planning policy framework, we should aim to identify and protect areas of tranquillity which are prized for their recreational value . These fields are such an asset. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Objection to development noted. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) (now Policies S1.4 and S4.1). A comprehensive assessment of potential housing sites is undertaken each year through the SHLAA and, from these, a wide range of brownfield sites have been included as suggested housing allocations in the Local Plan. However, there is a finite supply of such land and, in order to meet | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>the identified housing requirement the shortfall will have to be made up from delivery on the most sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Consequently, two strategic sites have been identified to help meet the future housing requirement. As a result, a comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing a maximum of 3,000 homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151347 | <p>Policy AS7:4. Strategic Sites Allocations. We note that these are major developments on safeguarded land. We are not convinced that the level of housing need is such as to require both these sites being released for development in the Plan period. We welcome (clause a)) the requirement for masterplanning, and we would argue for robust management such that development does not get significant variation from the original planning permission. The saga of the development of Newcastle Great Park jaundices our faith in planning on this scale.</p> | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The NT Population and Household Forecasts provide the latest available evidence of housing need and identify a requirement for the plan period from 2011 to 2032. The Council must plan to meet this need by allocating sites for development and it has been determined that development of an element of both the strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor is required to meet some of the identified need.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale.</p> <p>Even following allocation, a planning application(s) for the proposed strategic site will require approval before any development can commence. Such an application will be judged on merit through the development management process. The development will have to progress in line with the parameters set out in the approved planning permission.</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |
| 899660 | | RESIDENT | LP20151395 | <p>Site 22-26: Your plan will increase the population of Killingworth significantly. In the past we have been left out of any progress to have a Metro line to serve the Killingworth area. Most new residents will head to the bus station at Killingworth or use cars. The existing</p> | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | bus route options from Killingworth are quite limited and night time services are very limited. I request a serious effort be made to push for the inclusion of a Metro link & until this is in place a significant improvement to bus services introduced. E.g.. Extend the 63x service later at night & cut the industrial estate detour out of the night time service. | | | transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. A crucial aspect of this will be the need for additional public transport services and the Council currently working with Nexus and service providers, including the bus operators, in order to identify the improvements to the public transport network necessary to deliver the Local Plan. As part of this consideration of opportunities for potential Metro extensions and new stations is being taken. The 'Metro Strategy, 2030' prepared by Nexus, provides the strategic framework for planned future investment in system. Local Plan Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3) sets out the overall strategic approach to transport improvements. Whilst the every effort will be made to improve local bus services, and encourages this through criteria d) of Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3), the Council currently has limited influence over the operation of commercial services. | shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 797201 | | RESIDENT | LP20151410 | My home directly borders one of the plots of land proposed for redevelopment- the area between West Monkseaton and Murton. As the comments myself and hundreds of others made during the first round of | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>so-called consultation were disregarded, I am at a loss as to how to better convey the enormity of a decision to build on what little green space is left in our borough. These fields are enjoyed by countless dog walkers, cyclists and riders every day, all year round. But you already know that. The area is a natural and unspoilt habitat for a range of wildlife, but you know that too. The streets around my home suffered flood damage in 2012 and despite the measures put in place recently, these fields are often waterlogged still. Schools in the area are oversubscribed already, GP and dental surgeries are stretched to the limit and the roads are congested. Your report recognises all of these as real concerns. I understand the need to build more houses across North Tyneside, but strongly object to the lion's share being built in one concentrated area. I would urge councillors to look again at the proposed sites and reduce considerably the number of homes planned for the areas separating Rake Lane, Monkseaton and Murton.</p> | | | <p>the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> <p>The importance of community services, including schools, is reflected in Policies S10.13 and S10.1 (now Policies DM7.9 and S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. The need for additional services and facilities, as part of the Murton site, will be looked at as part of the Masterplan process, with consideration</p> | <p>the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>of need for access to education and healthcare being key priorities in the overall delivery of the site.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> | |
| 808714 | | RESIDENT | LP20151412 | <p>I do not wish to see the areas around Killingworth and especially Murton Village developed as this scheme indicates because of the following; - The whole scheme however developed will create 'urban sprawl' and have a detrimental impact on the character of North Tyneside - The scheme will create an overburden on all of the existing services and amenities - The scheme leads to the removal of quality open farmland which is green space and will destroy the existing environment - The scheme will result in a great loss of visual pleasure and leisure activity in the proposed areas - The scheme will lead to the joining up of the coastal towns with the rest of North Tyneside and remove and</p> | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>destroy the uniqueness of the current towns - The scheme will lead to over congestion of traffic which I do not believe will be alleviated without major road building schemes. Road building schemes must be avoided and from a personal viewpoint I don't believe that North Tyneside Council are able to manage the road traffic in this area (looking at the current situation) - The scheme will cause great harm to wildlife and nesting songbirds which are currently under great pressure from human activity. Whilst not a nature lover as such, then I believe that this scheme must not proceed if for no other reason. - This scheme will destroy the habitat and environment of Great Crested Newts which may exist in parts of the areas under consideration. The priority transport improvements - These are quite obviously roads even though you do not state this in the document, I object to these because they will not solve traffic issues but worsen them as the amount of traffic will increase, which it always does when new roads are created - The transport improvement around Murton must not proceed as it clearly impacts on part of the greenbelt and the proposed wildlife corridor as well as the existing properties on its route - The transport improvement will result in a flyover, over the metro line, this will result in</p> | | | <p>existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The importance of community services, including schools, is reflected in Policies S10.13 and S10.1 (now Policies S7.9 and S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. The need for additional services and facilities will be looked at as part of the Masterplan process. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the environmental impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network. New road links are felt to be essential in order to deliver the development. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | an increase in noise, pollution, visual intrusion, and will make the whole area very unpleasant. Furthermore - The residents of North Tyneside will not gain in any way from this scheme. - The only gains to be made from this scheme will be from the existing landowners and property developers. I completely object to any development of this nature and the entire scheme | | | | |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151457 | Site 22-26: o This site is in itself an important local wildlife site but also forms a key strategic wildlife corridor, permitting the movement of wildlife between North Tyneside and the wider countryside of Northumberland. o Development of housing and road building on this site would have a severely deleterious impact on the wildlife that is resident on the site, as well as on the movement of wildlife populations into and out of the borough; and would therefore be contrary to NPPF requirements for establishing coherent ecological networks. o The site is provides an important buffer, preventing Killingworth, Backworth, Shiremoor and Holystone from merging to form a single large conurbation. | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151462 | Site 35-41: o This site is an important local green space which acts as an important wildlife corridor, allowing the movement of wildlife between coastal wards and the north and west of thee borough. o The site provides important cover and forage for a number of migratory species reaching the north east coast before passing through elsewhere. o The site is also important to a number of declining bird species, including Skylark (a UK BAP priority species) and Meadow Pipit which breed on the fields contained in the site, as well as Lapwing (another UK BAP priority species), Golden Plover and Curlew which form habitual winter roosts on these fields. Starling, Reed Bunting and Dunnock also forage and breed in this area, all three of which are also UK BAP priority species. o In summer, the fields on this site provide | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Key to this is the need to proactively plan for the protection and enhancement of habitats for the wide variety of birds identified and | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>the principal source of food for migratory Swifts, Swallows and House Martins. If development were to occur on this site it would have a severely deleterious impact on the species noted above and in the case of the Swifts and Skylarks, it is likely that it would lead to their eventual loss as breeding species in this part of North Tyneside. o The site is also locally important for other species, including Fox and Hedgehog (another UK BAP priority species in significant decline) and development would have significant impacts on these. o Note that the species in bold in the paragraphs above are all included in the Newcastle and North Tyneside Biodiversity Action Plan and have specific action plans related to them. Development on this site would at the very least severely undermine these action plans. o These sites are susceptible to flooding which could make the construction of dwellings in this area inappropriate. It is highly likely that house building on these sites will lead to down-stream flooding in Monkseaton and Wellfield, as the ground's capacity to absorb surface water is reduced where vegetation is removed and replaced by impermeable substances such as tarmac and concrete.</p> | | | <p>other BAP priority species, something which will be informed by the expert advice of organisations and individuals. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | |
| 899953 | | RESIDENT | LP20151550 | Killingworth Moor 22 - 26: I would like to formally object to the proposal to | Site 22 to | AS 7.4 Strategic Site | In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>include the whole of the Killingworth Moor area (Lots 22-26) in to the Local Plan. Loss of Ecological Benefit The area consists of open space and is designated as a wildlife corridor. The proposal to build on the whole of the moor area directly contradicts with the proposal to deliver a successful and attractive borough. Your policy states that you wish to "ç "Provide new accessible open space, adding to the 25% of the borough that is already open space" This area is already accessible open space with footpaths and rights of way which will be lost. The area is of importance as an area of ecological benefit and supports protected species such as water vole and Dingey Skipper. The area provides feeding ground for the local bat population which transect the fields. Ground nesting birds are also supported and breed on this area. Urban Sprawl The recent developer that had planning permission granted stated in a public meeting that the Killingworth Moor site was seen as a desirable location and would command the higher priced houses due to the conservation village and countryside surroundings. The merging of the area with surrounding villages through building on green space will ensure that the identity of the village and township of Killingworth is lost as the settlement buffers proposed do not</p> | 26 | Allocations | <p>ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. Key to this is the need to proactively plan for the protection and enhancement of wildlife habitats, including for the species identified, something which will be informed by the expert advice of organisations and individuals.</p> <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised</p> | <p>solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>adequately protect the existing conurbations. Flooding The Letch and Ouseburn has a well-documented history of localised flooding in the Palmersville and Forest Hall Catchment with many homes at risk See Figure 1. As such any development would need to carefully design as to not impact any further on this sensitive receiving water body. The green space development will reduce the available land bank to allow surface water to infiltrate into the receiving groundwaters and as such increase drought potential and increase flooding from Run off. The Foul Sewer system is classified by Northumbrian Water critical drainage area and are at a high risk of flooding therefore it would intimate that there would not be further capacity on the sewer network to take the fowl from an additional developments without significant infrastructure upgrades. Figure 1 Extract taken from EA What's in my backyard (see attached)</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) As the whole lot 22-26 lot area would be implicated as proposed development then any scheme would need to be considered as part of a whole scheme development area and a full Environmental Statement (ES) would need to be provided. EIA is a tool for systematically examining and assessing</p> | | | <p>for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. The importance of the need to maintain and enhance PROW and other links is recognised in the work. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the Coal Authority in both developing planning policy and through the development management process. Further work is to be</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the potential impact and effects of development on the environment. Essentially, it is a process that examines the environmental consequences of development actions before they go ahead (i.e. are granted the relevant permissions and licences). The requirement for EIA is established by European Directive 85/33/EEC (as amended by 97/11/EC) on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (The EIA Directive). The EIA Directive is implemented in the UK through national law, of which the following Acts and Regulations would be considered to be relevant to this whole site development even when sectioned off in lots. Travel The road and public transport network would not support additional pressure. Killingworth has limited access points onto the major transport road infrastructure without access through highly congested B roads. A major infrastructure investment to public transport would be required such as the Metro extended to Killingworth Moor. As the impact of further traffic to already congested roads would cause significant adverse impact on local residents. Sterilisation of Mineral Reserves The underlying coal fields below these sites contain many thousands of tonnes of coal that was abandoned when it was not</p> | | | <p>undertaken to consider mineral safeguarding and potential prior extraction opportunities in order to provide the necessary evidence for the next stage of the Local Plan.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, the requirement for additional services and facilities will also be considered, including healthcare provision. More generally, the importance of community services is reflected in Policies S10.13 and S10.1 (now Policies S7.9 and S7.1 (now S4.1)) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>economically viable to extract. If these reserves are to be exploited in future years then building large swathes of property over the area will sterilise the minerals. Access to amenities There is already limited school places for the population in the Killingworth area and additional houses would significantly impact on the education of pupils. Doctors, dentist and other medical services have extensive waiting lists for appointments and again additional population would cripple the existing system.</p> | | | | |
| 805535 | | | LP20151558 | <p>Why was Killingworth lane B 1317 not mentioned ? As new junctions are proposed from the K / Moor S.Site, at present, it is a very busy rat run at peak times as is Simonside Way - East Bailey). North Tyneside Council is spending Â£150million on road infrastructure over the next 5 years. However I am concerned as at present these roads are at full capacity at peak times ! The additional traffic generated by the proposed 2 strategic sites will cause gridlock from Monkseaton to Longbenton / Gosforth Park area. I have spoken to many people who think a new junction is proposed on the A19 from one of the proposed K / Moor roads, the reason for this is they do not know at present a public footpath, farmers lane and tunnel exists (which is only 5.4 metres wide x 4.2 metres high) through the embankment of the</p> | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>A19, and leads to a roundabout on the Shiremoor By-Pass. On the N.T.C. L.P. map the latter section of proposed new road from the tunnel to Shiremoor By-pass is totally obscured, as 'Northumberland park ' is written across the route. Hence people think a new junction on to the A19 is proposed. The tunnel is only 5.4 metres wide, enough for 2 cars to pass, but no room for a pedestrian footpath ! Thus avoiding the use of the powerlines as a wildlife corridor- Running from the Seaton Burn waggon way wildlife corridor along the side of the B1317 road to the old R.E.M.E. site which has planning permission for Bellway housing. This would stop the merging of communities and retain a measure of green open space on the upper East side of Killingworth Moor, and fulfil objectives of AS7.4 (d.& e.) Also S8.4, (c, d,) +8.20. - e.g.- " Green infrastructure corridors must be safeguarded through S.S. Allocations. Major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identity, maintaining amenity space and access to the countryside and biodiversity".. This would stop the urban sprawl of the Killingworth estate joining in with the new proposed housing estate."Wildlife corridors allow movement of wildlife</p> | | | <p>transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes consideration of the most appropriate means of access to the sites, the route and scale of the new roads proposed and the impacts and mitigation necessary in order to improve the existing highway network, such as the B1317 and the potential for a link under the A19. The routes as shown on the Policies Map are indicative, only being a reflection of the earliest discussions as to how some of the identified issues might be resolved. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. In selecting sites for allocation, the direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and ecology are crucial factors in determining suitability. Partial coverage by a wildlife corridor does not automatically render development inappropriate. However careful consideration will be necessary in order to determine whether a suitable scheme can be delivered – including through site layout, the proposed area for development and overall yield. It is recognised that further policy relating to development and wildlife corridors is required in the Local Plan. The importance of the need to protect biodiversity networks is recognised through the Local Plan process</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | between areas of habitat, linking sites and reducing the risk of isolated populations becoming unstable and dying out. Therefore it is important the network of wildlife sites and links between them is maintained and enhanced ". there is evidence to prove that electricity pylon routes are of no use as wildlife corridors. | | | and opportunities for enhancement of existing and creation of new networks will continue to be explored and prioritised. | |
| 899991 | Tyne and Wear Public Transport Users Group | RESIDENT | LP20151585 | The plan includes two very large housing growth areas at Murton and Killingworth Moor. In both cases the text uses wording "consider the feasibility of new Metro Stations" , and we hope that these will be a condition for housing development, as happened with previous development adjacent to Northumberland Park Metro station , which was funded by the developers as their s106 contribution. | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. The need for improvements to the public transport network are crucial to the delivery of a sustainable development. Work on establishing a business case and the feasibility of potential metro provision is underway. The Council is currently working with Nexus in order to identify the improvements to the public transport network necessary to deliver the Local Plan, this includes opportunities for potential Metro extensions and new stations. Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3) sets out the overall strategic approach to transport improvements. The 'Metro Strategy, 2030' prepared by Nexus, provides the strategic framework for planned future investment in system. The most appropriate mechanism | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | for delivering a new Metro station will be identified as and when necessary. | |
| 396220 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20151742 | Sites 35 to 41 - concerns Residents have contacted members of our Group to express their concerns about the proposals in the North Tyneside Local Plan Consultation 2015. In particular: 2. The history of flooding, especially in the Earsdon, Wellfield and Monkseaton areas gives rise to concern that 3,000 new houses in the Murton area will exacerbate the problem. 3. There is already traffic congestion in the coastal area which will increase with such a level of new buildings, and similarly near Killingworth Moor. 4. It is felt that the "indicative strategic settlement buffer" will be inadequate, in both areas, providing insufficient separation between developments. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is to be prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. The decisions over the scale and layout of</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | development will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The exact scale and scope of this is still to be determined. | |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151799 | Strategic site allocations at Murton and Killingworth Moor, identified within AS7.4, will require careful planning, phasing and implementation to ensure the capacity of the sewerage network can facilitate development at these sites. With regard to the site at Murton specifically, which is expected to provide up to 3,000 homes, discussions between NWL and potential developers have identified that the site presents the opportunity for surface water separation from the existing combined sewerage network in order to create capacity for foul flows from the proposed development. In this respect, we believe that the wording within AS7.4 must emphasise the importance of proper drainage masterplanning for the sites identified to ensure a cohesive approach to sustainable drainage. We are yet to | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Comments are noted. The Council is committed to joint working with NWL to achieve the best outcome for sustainable water management and drainage at both Murton and Killingworth to protect against increased flood risk, and contribute where opportunities arise towards the separation of surface water from Howdon Sewerage Works | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>hold similar conversations for the sites identified at Killingworth Moor, which are expected to provide up to 2,000 homes, however we believe that there is the opportunity to build upon the positive work already achieved at Murton to facilitate a sustainable approach to drainage across both strategic sites identified in the LPCD. A partnership between North Tyneside Council, the Environment Agency and NWL is currently developing a strategic scheme for sustainable surface water management across the wider Killingworth and Longbenton areas. As part of this scheme, a transfer of surface water flows from Longbenton Letch to Forest Hall Letch is proposed in order to reduce existing flood risk where Longbenton Letch currently discharges to the public sewerage system. In order to facilitate this transfer, upstream attenuation of flows is required in the Forest Hall Letch catchment, in an area presently marked as indicative strategic settlement buffer to the south of the Killingworth Moor strategic site on the policy map published by North Tyneside Council as part of the present consultation. There may be opportunities for developers of strategic sites at Killingworth Moor to work with the existing partnership to further improve surface water management within this area of North</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>Tyneside, and we would encourage developers to seek early consultation with the relevant parties as sites come forward for development. We would welcome the opportunity to work with North Tyneside Council and potential developers on the masterplanning of the strategic housing development site at Killingworth Moor, and again believe that emphasis must be placed upon drainage masterplanning within the wording of AS7.4. Due to the imperative nature of sustainable surface water management, we would request that more specific and explicit reference to surface water separation schemes be made within AS7.4 as a pre-requisite to planning permission. Inclusion of flood risk and surface water management as a stand-alone point within AS7.4 would serve to emphasise the importance of these factors within the sustainability of the identified strategic allocations. We suggest that this policy is revisited with a stronger emphasis upon sustainable water management.</p> | | | | |
| 396253 | Northumberland Estates | DEVELOPER | LP20151820 | <p>Policy AS7.4 relates specifically to the strategic site allocations of Killingworth Moor and Murton. Killingworth Moor has been identified as providing a maximum of 2,000 houses, whilst Murton is identified as providing a maximum of 3,000 houses. It is considered that these maximums should not be set as definite limits, and</p> | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The strategic allocations policy proposed the delivery of 4,500 homes within the plan period between the two strategic sites, with the masterplanning work currently being undertaken being central to determining the exact balance. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites</p> | <p>Policy for Strategic Sites has been amended with the joint policy for Killingworth Moor and Murton Gap split into separate policies for each, indicating the approximate capacity of each site for development. This new</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | that a degree of flexibility should be provided to these figures. It is considered that as long as either strategic site can demonstrate a level of deliverability, then a number of houses in excess of the allocated 2,000 and 3,000 should be accepted. The Northumberland Estates supports the promotion of Master-planning by Policy AS7.4. Master-planning between the relevant landowners and North Tyneside Council will ensure that they are developed in an integrated way with the surrounding communities and local area. | | | at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This is being undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date relating to highway access, flooding and drainage, landscape and ecology. | policy approach also takes into consideration the outcome of further work on the concept plan and the overall |
| 769763 | Bellway Homes (NE) | DEVELOPER | LP20151926 | Bellway has secured an interest in the land identified on the attached plan which is bound by Park Lane, Boundary Mill shopping outlet and A 191 New York Road. The site is capable of accommodating c. 270 units typically family units in a range of sizes and types. The site forms part of the proposed wider allocation identified as 'Murton' within Policy AS7.4- Strategic Site Allocations. Bellway fully support the allocation and the proposed release of the site for housing. The site is allocated as Safeguarded land within the saved adopted Local Plan and therefore the principle of housing development in this location is firmly established. Access can be achieved from Park Lane providing direct access into Bellway's site and could be designed to provide a connection into | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Comments with regard to the Bellway-owned aspect of the site noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will be undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including landowners and statutory bodies, including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date. It is not considered that the requirement to undertake masterplanning is prohibitive to the timely delivery of the site. on a detailed point direct access from Park Lane is not considered in highway terms to be a desirable solution to accessing the site. | Policy for Strategic Sites has been amended with the joint policy for Killingworth Moor and Murton Gap split into separate policies for each, indicating the approximate capacity of each site for development. This new policy approach also takes into consideration the outcome of further work on the concept plan and the overall |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the wider allocation. A secondary emergency access could also be achieved from New York Road. Bellway's land interest is capable of coming forward in the short term (0-5 year period) and would meet the deliverable tests set out in the NPPF as there are no known impediments to its delivery. Recognising the importance of the comprehensive delivery of the wider proposed allocation, Bellway are committed to ensuring the development of their landholding would not prejudice the implementation of the wider site in accordance with criteria b) of the Policy. However, Bellway's site could come forward independently and be accessed directly from Park Lane with connections provided to the site boundary to comprehensively connect and integrate with to the wider allocation. Finally, the delivery of Bellway's land interest provides a logical extension to the existing built up area and would not lead to the coalescence of any settlements including Shiremoor with Murton. Bellway owns land in the central element of the Killingworth Moor allocation as delineated on the attached plan. Bellway obtained full planning permission on 23 January 2015 for the redevelopment of the former REME Depot, Killingworth Village (the land identified in red on</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the plan) to provide 125 dwellings with access from the 81317 West Lane (LPA ref: 14/00730/FUL) ("the REME site"). Construction of the site has begun and is it is anticipated that the development will complete in 2018. Bellway also own the land immediately surrounding the REME site (shown within the blue line on the plan and hereafter referred to as "the extension land"). This land provides a logical extension to the REME site and has potential to provide a further 180 units which would be fully deliverable in the short term (i.e. in parallel with and following on from the completion of the REME site). The ownership forms part of the proposed allocation identified as 'Murton' within Policy AS7.4- Strategic Site Allocations. Bellway fully support the allocation. The ownership is within an area allocated as Safeguarded land within the saved adopted Local Plan and therefore the principle of housing development in this location is already firmly established. Whilst the finer details of the comprehensive master plan for the allocation will be refined in due course informed by the technical work still to be undertaken we support the principle and logic of a western access through the approved REME site to facilitate the development of the extension land and wider allocation beyond. The through road approved</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>for the REME site has been designed to cater for additional capacity and to allow for bus penetration to serve the extension land and the wider land as required. Also the junction at the entrance to the REME site on West Lane can be upgraded to a roundabout to increase capacity. Delivery of the REME site and early delivery of the extension land would not prejudice the implementation of the wider allocation and indeed could assist in facilitating its development in accordance with criteria b) of Policy AS7.4. Bellway fully support the Council's approach and identification of land at Murton and Killingworth Moor as forming strategic allocations and look forward to working with the Council and other landowners to bring the sites forward through delivery of a comprehensive master plan. The sites are capable of making a significant contribution to meeting housing needs across the Borough and within the local area. As currently worded, the policy seeks to deliver up to 4,500 homes during the plan period. However, collectively Murton and Killingworth Moor are identified as providing 5,000 units. As such, 4,500 homes should be the minimum to be delivered. Bellway look forward to working with the Council to determine the capacity of the two Strategic Allocations through the masterplanning process. Bellway</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>support the Council's approach in seeking to deliver comprehensively developed masterplans for the sites and are happy to work collaboratively with other landowners to prepare the masterplans based upon a range of technical assessments that demonstrate the deliverability of the sites. However, Bellway have the following specific comments on the policy: "ç Bellway question the level of certainty provided by concept frameworks and suggest the first stage should be the production of the master plan itself informed by supporting technical documents. The master plan should be prepared in tandem with the Local Plan, and sit alongside the Plan, to articulate how the site should be delivered. "ç Bellway agree there is a need to identify a strategy for the timing, funding and provision of infrastructure but suggest that this should be undertaken as part of the comprehensive masterplanning exercise (with the level of provision/contributions commensurate to the scale of each site) so as not to delay or impede the subsequent delivery of individual sites at the planning application stage. "ç Criteria c), d), e), f) and g) refer to the preparation of a number of allocation-wide strategies including access, transport, green infrastructure and landscape. Bellway suggest that</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | these criteria are reworded to refer to their inclusion within the approved comprehensive master plan document rather than requiring these via individual proposals/planning applications. This would ensure that proposals which are in accordance with the approved master plan can come forward post-adoption uninhibited by the requirement for further allocation-wide technical work. | | | | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151943 | Natural England are pleased to see support given to Green Infrastructure (GI) in this policy as the provision of GI provides multi-functional benefits (including alternative recreational opportunities to the coast), however our concerns regarding sites 35-41 at Murton listed under S7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites apply equally here. - Natural England note that the potential housing development sites in Whitley Bay have been screened in for Appropriate Assessment (AA), however the potential for cumulative impacts as a result of recreational disturbance from housing beyond the Coastal Zone on Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar have not been considered. Natural England is particularly concerned that large allocations such as sites 35-41 at Murton are collectively stated to provide a maximum of 3,000 dwellings. Although further away from the Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar than | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A revised Habitat Regulations Assessment and Appropriate Assessment has been prepared. This identifies a range of proposals to mitigate potential impacts upon international designated sites and has been involved additional consultation with Natural England on the proposed approach. | Improved mitigation measures incorporated into the pre-submission draft Local Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the development sites in Whitley Bay, the number of dwellings proposed is far greater and so recreational disturbance should be considered here in particular. If it has been determined that sites beyond the Coastal Zone are unlikely to significantly affect the Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar, this should be justified. When undertaking your Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), allocations that are likely to contribute to increased recreational activities should be reassessed, taking into account potential impacts from recreational disturbance both alone and in combination. Unless an allocation is large and in close proximity to the site, recreational disturbance is often a cumulative/in combination effect that occurs as a result of a planar€™s housing distribution. As the location of an allocation is not the primary determinant of whether new residents will visit and affect the SPA/Ramsar (accessibility and attractiveness are key determinants), this assessment would be more effective when considered against overall housing numbers and their strategic distribution. This would avoid a complex in combination assessment of individual allocations. When determining likely significant effects or adverse effects on integrity, the HRA should consider the in combination effects of policies that</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>increase housing in proximity to the coast and promote the coast as a visitor destination. This assessment should consider whether the mitigation measures within policy DM.8 are sufficient to avoid the combined effects of more housing and an attractive and accessible coast. Natural England notes that the assessment of the development sites 35-41 at Murton listed in the local plan are absent from the SA and HRA. However the SA refers to two sites at Murton (116 "" Murton North and 117 "" Murton South) with Murton North and Murton South also the names used in the HRA. It is unclear to Natural England whether sites 35-41 and 116-117 cover the same land. If this is the case then the numbering system used should be consistent for clarity. If this is not the case then given their importance of Murton in delivering the housing development site numbers these should be assessed in the SA and HRA in line with all other development sites.</p> | | | | |
| 805556 | | | LP20151972 | <p>I raised a number of comments at the earlier consultation stage, primarily focusing on the following concerns in respect of sites located in and around Killingworth: - Potential for substantial congestion in an area already subject to significant road usage / delays. Many people living in this area travel towards Newcastle and not along the</p> | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>Thank you your comments are noted. The local plan process is key to ensuring that overall needs for growth can be accommodated by ensuring that the right infrastructure is in place to address potential impacts. To inform this ongoing traffic modelling is underway to identify the requirements for new road infrastructure. Meanwhile evidence of flood risk,</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space,</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>A19 corridor, there is only one road on which to do this, which is already heavily congested especially during rush hour. - Potential for excessive demands for school places, in an area that is already heavily over-subscribed. - Potential for the loss of significant green space. - Potential for the loss of identity, amalgamating Killingworth with surrounding areas, generating a continuous urban sprawl that stretches to the coast. With regret, I conclude that your response offers little in the way of substance to alleviate these concerns. In this respect, I echo the sentiments of an earlier responder, who has recently provided me with details of their concerns: AS7.4.-(d) Access and transport strategy- Killingworth Way, Great Lime Road, Shiremoor By-pass. - Rake Lane, Earsdon By-pass. (Why was Killingworth lane B 1317 not mentioned ? As new junctions are proposed from the K / Moor S.Site, at present, it is a very busy rat run at peak times as is Simonside Way - East Bailey). North Tyneside Council is spending Â£150million on road infrastructure over the next 5 years. However I am concerned as at present these roads are at full capacity at peak times ! The additional traffic generated by the proposed 2 strategic sites will cause gridlock from Monkseaton to Longbenton / Gosforth Park area. I</p> | | | <p>biodiversity value, heritage and character will all be required to be considered and addressed before development could take place.</p> | <p>facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>would like to propose a dual carriageway By-Pass of Backworth to run from the Grey Horse Pub roundabout (Shiremoor By-pass) to the A1056, A19 intersection. This would stop the rat run through Backworth and divert traffic away from Holystone roundabout. I would also like to propose closing access to Whitley Road and old Holystone village from Holystone roundabout and use the exit to create an access on to the K / Moor S / Site. This direct connection to the A19 is of vital importance, it is essential if K / Moor is to be developed as proposed and would take pressure off the A1056, B1317, B1505 (Great lime Road). A road bridge over the Metro line would be required on K / Moor just as a road bridge over the Metro line is needed on the Murton S.site's single road. I have spoken to many people who think a new junction is proposed on the A19 from one of the proposed K / Moor roads, the reason for this is they do not know at present a public footpath, farmers lane and tunnel exists (which is only 5.4 metres wide x 4.2 metres high) through the embankment of the A19, and leads to a roundabout on the Shiremoor By-Pass. On the N.T.C. L.P. map the latter section of proposed new road from the tunnel to Shiremoor By-pass is totally obscured, as 'Northumberland park ' is written across the route. Hence people</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | think a new junction on to the A19 is proposed. The tunnel is only 5.4 metres wide, enough for 2 cars to pass, but no room for a pedestrian footpath ! | | | | |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151999 | <p>Policy AS7.4 set out the proposed allocation of two strategic site allocations at Killingworth Moor and Murton. As set out in the introduction, this representation on behalf of the consortium refers only to the land at Killingworth Moor, notwithstanding any land interests of the consortium at Murton. The consortium is very supportive of a strategic allocation at Killingworth Moor. They have already collated a significant volume of information regarding the masterplanning of the site which demonstrates that the site has no insurmountable constraints and can be delivered, in its entirety, within the plan period. As attached in Appendix 2, the Consortium re-submits a previous illustrative master plan for the site but look forward to engaging with the Council over refinement of the master plan before the next publication of the Local Plan following further discussions and evidence gathering.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the support for the allocation, the consortium has the following concerns and suggested changes to the Policy wording: Number of Houses Policy AS7.4 covers two areas of land; Killingworth Moor and</p> | Site 22 to 26 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The strategic allocations policy proposed the delivery of 4,500 homes within the plan period between the two strategic sites, with the masterplanning work currently being undertaken being central to determining the exact balance. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This is being undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date relating to highway access, flooding and drainage, landscape and ecology. | Policy for Strategic Sites has been amended with the joint policy for Killingworth Moor and Murton Gap split into separate policies for each, indicating the approximate capacity of each site for development. This new policy approach also takes into consideration the outcome of further work on the concept plan and the overall |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Murton. The overall requirement across the two sites is set out as "up to" 4,500 homes and a "maximum" of 3,000 houses at Murton and a "maximum" 2000 houses at Killingworth Moor. How these figures "up to" and "maximum" figures have been arrived at is not clear within the plan. Policy S7.2 sets out a need for 16,632 homes for the plan period and where (in table 8 of the local plan) total homes completed up to December 2014 (1,633) and existing planning permissions (4,810) are removed from the figure, the outstanding gross requirement is 10,189. Policy S7.3 identifies land for 8,806 new homes. It is understood that any surplus (1,383) would come from windfall sites. As set out in comments to Policy S7.2, the consortium also considers that 100% of the sites with planning permission will not come forward and should be discounted by 10% to account for non delivery. This 10% discounting is widely recognised and has been accepted in recent Examinations into Local Plans. In doing so this would increase the deficit between the need and the supply (notwithstanding whether the OAN should be increased or whether a 20% rather than 5% buffer should be included on the requirement). The consortium is concerned that under Policy AS7.4 it is not justified or in</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>accordance with NPPF (paragraph 47 which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing) to have a "maximum" restriction on the number of houses proposed on the sites as this unnecessarily restricts the supply, a concern where the allocations within the plan already falls short of the requirement and therefore reliant upon windfalls. Greater certainty on delivery would be achieved by setting an approximate number of houses that could be exceeded where necessary. The Council will be aware that there are a number of strategic allocations in the emerging NewcastleGateshead Core Strategy and the Inspector assessing that plan (concluding it to be sound) set out an "approximate" number of houses that may be delivered from those sites, not setting a ceiling within the allocation thus allowing flexibility. The consortium would suggest this approach for Policy AS7.4 and the removal of the terms "up to" and "maximum" to be replaced with "approximately" and making clear that the number of houses proposed is not a ceiling. The consortium considers that further masterplanning of the sites will provide greater clarity on their capacity and, for the reasons set out above, they do not consider this number allocated to the site should be a ceiling as such an approach would</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>not be sound or consistent with NPPF. Employment Development As set out in comments to Policies S5.1/5.2 the consortium supports 17 ha of new employment at Killingworth Moor, the type and location of which will be dictated by ongoing masterplanning of the site to be agreed with the Council. The consortium considers reference to the new employment development should be included in Policy AS7.4 given that it is a strategic allocation rather than a specific housing allocation. Other Development Policy AS7.4 includes additional development at Killingworth Moor for provision of primary education and new local retail facilities via a new neighbourhood centre for local facilities. The concept of inclusion of these elements is broadly supported subject to masterplanning of the site and clear evidence of need and viability that will be prepared by the Consortium in consultation with the Council. Policy AS7.4 also makes reference to the need for secondary education to be located on either Murton or Killingworth Moor but that the location is not yet confirmed. The consortium retains its position on this until further discussions have taken place with the Council over the need and preferred location. Green Infrastructure The consortium agree that for Killingworth Moor there is a need for green</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>infrastructure including open space and wildlife corridors and these will be included within a masterplan being progressed for the site to be agreed with the Council in accordance with the Policy. The consortium is concerned to see a demarcation of "indicative strategic settlement buffer" on the Policies Map. The consortium do not believe that a detailed buffer needs to be shown on the map "" particularly as it is described as indicative. The consortium suggests that the Wildlife Corridor should be focused on the Forest Hall Letch watercourse and that this would serve as a strategic settlement buffer between the new development and Palmersville/Forest Hall. The consortium do not believe that the former landfill cell is needed to fulfil such a role so this should be deleted from the buffer. In bullet (d) of Policy AS7.4 it is stated that the access and transport strategy should "maximise" the potential for walking cycling and public transport. The consortium propose that the policy should be to "fully realise" the potential. There has to be a balance between putting paths and buses everywhere and the beneficial links which should be made. Masterplanning The consortium agrees that a masterplan for the sites is required but that it should be agreed and form part</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>of the adopted Local Plan rather than being a requirement after the plan is adopted which would delay delivery of new development on the site. The consortium is familiar with this approach, currently progressing masterplanning in Newcastle and Gateshead where a Core Strategy is about to be adopted including strategic allocations. However, experience from those local authority areas suggests that an agreement on a masterplan as part of the Local Plan would be advantageous in speeding up the delivery of development on the strategic sites and the ability to submit applications quickly after adoption of the Local Plan. The consortium would highlight to the Council that changes were made to the Policies for the NewcastleGateshead Core Strategy strategic allocations by the Inspector. Those changes included that it was not necessary for there to be a single application but that multiple applications would be acceptable. It is therefore welcomed that the Policy AS7.4 recognises (in criterion b) that more than one application would be appropriate provided it does not prejudice the implementation of the whole development. It is the intention of the consortium to work closely with the Council to prepare a masterplan for the site for their full consideration before the EiP. Access and Highways</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | The consortium agrees the need for an access and transport strategy to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and use of public transport and will work closely with the officers of the Council in preparing a strategy for the highways links within the site and the principal connections to Killingworth Way, Great Lime Road, Shiremoor Bypass (under the A19) and the A1056 and including the consented REME site. | | | | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152038 | Policy AS7.4 planning for strategic site allocations sets out the LPA's approach towards the two large strategic allocation areas of Killingworth Moor and Murton. We are generally supportive of this policy approach and support the allocation of these areas in general however have some specific issues and concerns relating to the requirements of this policy. The policy sets out the overall scope and approximate size of development of being up to 3000 units at Murton and up to 2000 at Killingworth Moor and yet the policy sets up to 4500 during the plan period. More clarity is sought in sub section (a) and (b) showing how these 4500 units are expected to come forward (and to which site). For example: (a) Murton, allowing for future master planning too establish the specific capacity and layout of the site provision for a maximum of 3000(2700 within the plan period) | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | General support for policy noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This is being undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date relating to highway access, flooding and drainage, landscape and ecology. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplanning to determine the exact balance between the two sites . This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and | Policy for Strategic Sites has been amended with the joint policy for Killingworth Moor and Murton Gap split into separate policies for each, indicating the approximate capacity of each site for development. This new policy approach also takes into consideration the outcome of further work on the concept plan and the overall |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | homes at sites 35-41 on the LPCD 2015 policies map, between Monkseaton and Shiremoor: As currently worded the policy suggests that "any application for development is preceded by a comprehensive master plan" . This is a two stage planning process which is unnecessary and can be streamlined into one process under existing Development Management processes. Persimmon suggests that the policy is re worded to remove "application" from this to read as follows: "a. Any development is preceded by and is consistent with, a comprehensive master plan prepared collaboratively with and approved by the Council. The master plan will include the whole site which integrates the site with its surroundings communities, wider countryside and town centre." Persimmon has engaged with the other land owners and the Council to progress the consultation master plan for the Murton area. This policy subject to the above alteration is endorsed and supported. A further detailed submission has been made on behalf of the Murton Development Consortium. | | | networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. It is not considered that the requirement to undertake masterplanning is prohibitive to the timely delivery of the site, particularly as this is already underway, and is considered essential in order to guide the sustainable development of both sites. | |
| 901149 | | RESIDENT | LP20152068 | I understand the Local Authority's need for a local plan. Central government's proposals on planning and enthusiastic developers have reduced the ability of local people to influence the area in | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>which we live. The development of such a large area of land on Killingworth Moor is a contentious issue. It is my view that the proposed plan does not provide sufficient protection to the Killingworth Village conservation area. The main concern is the road infrastructure proposal; in particular the link between the site and the B1317. This road is unsuitable for the increased volume of traffic from such a development. Another area of concern is the strain on existing amenities i.e.: schools, doctors surgeries etc and the lack of public transport. Given the distance between Murton and Killingworth how can joint facilities be workable? The authority's said a masterplan would be required for the area (sites 22-26). Not much detail on how this would be formulated is given in the plan. This puts residents in the position of commenting on a plan with limited detail and a wish list of proposals. It is easy to be sceptical of the Local Authority's plans. The junction at Palmersville has been constructed leading to Killingworth Moor complete with traffic lights. This, together with the size of the roads proposed on the REME Development leading to the Moor, gives the impression the development was always going to take place. It is my opinion that no further access to the Moor should be granted</p> | | | <p>manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes -in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. Central to this is the need to protect the setting of Killingworth Village Conservation Area.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be prepared to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development. This includes measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. The impact on the B1317 will be of key concern, with the objective on minimising additional flows on the existing highway network. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable.</p> <p>In addition, a wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in</p> | <p>the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | through the REME Development onto the B1317. Access to the site via the A19/Holystone should be considered. A high priority should be the formulation of an amenities strategy to include: schools, surgeries, footpaths and public transport routes. It is important local people have equal input into any development of a masterplan for this site. The developers will be lobbying hard to ensure they get their way and maximise the amount of land released for housing. The masterplan should not be written by the developers and any future proposals for the site should be resisted until a masterplan is agreed. | | | transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3) and the IDP for further detail. This includes working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links. The importance of community services, including schools and GPs, is reflected in Policies S10.13 and S10.1 (now Policies S7.10 and S7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. The option for the provision of joint services between the two strategic sites will be explored together with providers and key stakeholders in order to deliver the most effective results for both new and existing communities and the wider population. As part of the next stage of the Local Plan, the Publication , more detailed proposals for the development of the two strategic sites will be outlined. Residents will be given the chance to comment on those proposals through the formal consultation process, helping to shape the future direction of the development and supporting infrastructure and facilities at both Murton and Killingworth Moor. | |
| 808139 | | RESIDENT | LP20152113 | Further to my recent letter, it has come to my attention that further alterations to the Site Ref: 3 5 - 41 Murton have been made but not included in the recent consultation . These concern the offset biodiversity | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>land from the site at the Rising Sun County Park. It appears that the land to the north north/west of Murton has now been designated a nature/wetland area to compensate for the above loss at the Rising Sun County Park. Therefore more hedgerows trees etc. will have to be provided for the habitat of the affected wildlife. This wetland will no doubt accommodate some of the flood prevention measures required for West Monkseaton. If this offset biodiversity land is to be accommodated on this site the main road that is indicated on the consultation will have to be revised as it cuts through the middle of the allocated land. Also the public rights of way will have to be addressed, or are they to be sacrificed for progress. It appears that the consultation is flawed as various major alterations are being made and the general public are not made aware of this. If these were in the pipeline why could they not have been included in an appendix to the plan?</p> | | | <p>the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site.</p> <p>The Masterplan process will take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. This includes resolution of issues relating to PROW. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable.</p> | <p>the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152160 | Policy AS7.4 English Heritage welcomes commitments to make best use of existing housing; to require a degree of masterplanning to inform on-site development; and the requirement for a heritage management strategy to guide design and layout. Such a strategy should seek to mitigate or avoid harmful effects upon the historic environment but simultaneously encourage, where applicable, the use and reuse of heritage assets in regeneration plans. | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver both of the proposed strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As noted, a heritage management strategy will be integral to this work. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |
| 804541 | | | LP20152200 | West Monkseaton can't cope with extra traffic for 300 houses never mind 3000! (4 roundabouts and 8 sets of lights in 1.1 miles, crazy). Murton to have identity protection, what about everyone else? Tracks/open land from West Monkseaton to Murton are one of the few open spaces available in the local area. Wildlife will also suffer. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. | |
| 901337 | | RESIDENT | LP20152224 | Site 35-41: I am still against housing on this site due to reasons stated by many at the last consultation e.g. loss of green fields. I hadn't realised a road would be built on the Earsdon side of the Metro and am also against this for the same reasons plus added noise pollution and concern about possible flooding from run off from road. | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The proposed strategic transport route identified forms a key element of the proposal in supporting sustainable access for the site and helping to reduce potential traffic issues at both Park Lane and Seatonville Road. The requirement for and benefits arising as a result of this are supported by ongoing traffic modelling studies. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale.</p> <p>As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary. Importantly, the impact which the proposed new link road will have upon the environment, including the Green Belt,</p> | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | ecology and any flooding issues, will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. | |
| | | | LP20152232 | Conservatives fighting to keep Green Belt land to separate Monkseaton and Shiremoor which were both villages so why should Murton get special treatment. Lack of schools to accommodate 3,000 homes. 3,000 homes "" 1 car per home = 3,000 cars and more there is no room on our roads "" more congestion | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. The importance of community services, including schools, is reflected in Policies S10.13 and S10.1 (now Policies S7.9 and 7.1) which outline how the Council will respond so that the infrastructure required is delivered in order to make new development acceptable and, to meet anticipated future needs. | |
| 807245 | | RESIDENT | LP20152239 | I shudder to think the effect the proposed new road through Murton will have on existing infrastructure | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, the impacts of the proposed new link road will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan and the detailed planning process. | No amendments proposed. |
| 808545 | | RESIDENT | LP20152241 | Significant development around Murton village is impractical for so many reasons, the many negatives are covered within NTC 2013 consultation so I won't revisit. Transport/Roads: I find it quite unbelievable that you are considering installing a new road to link from New York to the Earsdon bypass, this would significantly introduce additional noise and safety issues in Murton and spoil views from | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This will outline the specific capacity and layout of the site, providing homes in the most suitable areas and at an appropriate scale. This decision will take account of site constraints and matters relating to ecology, sustainability and deliverability and will | An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>Monkseaton housing where the 'flyover' for the Metro line is built. Traffic relief was supposed to be given by the new Earsdon bypass. Overdevelopment of the Cobalt Park has caused much of the congestion issues why not introduce access to the A19 west? Greenfield site/compensation sites Why is such a significant area of Greenfield site even being considered? What about the agreed compensation sites for wildlife around Murton from Persimmon Benton development which has already started? The Murton 'buffer zone' doesn't appear to acknowledge this so has NTC already reneged? Flooding Significant flooding occurs in Monkseaton, West Monkseaton, Murton Village and Shiremoor, how will this really be dealt with? Sites 35-41 area vs. house volume? There seems to be a significantly disproportionate allocation in numbers of houses vs. areas, site 41 has 1080 houses whilst Site 37 (served by new road) only has 245 they are of similar area why is this? Possible solution Site 41 " By far the biggest number of houses proposed development here wouldn't impact many residents as its opposite Rake Lane hospital and stays well away from Murton to the North West. North East/ East is Monkseaton High Scholl and it doesn't go as far as The Laurels estate. Good access to</p> | | | <p>ensure the most appropriate balance between land utilised for development whilst supporting wildlife habitats and networks and retaining significant areas of open space, including accessible space for recreation and leisure. This includes proposals for a strategic settlement buffer to prevent merging of existing communities and retain individual character and identity. The exact distribution of development, including the yields and densities proposed on individual parcels of land, has yet to be determined. Work as part of the Masterplan process will work select the most appropriate scale and scope to this layout. Therefore the yields identified on separate parcels (35 to 41) are simply indicative. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. Importantly, the impact which the proposed new link road will have upon the environment, including the Green Belt, will be carefully considered with mitigation measures proposed through the Masterplan</p> | <p>broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Rake Lane. Sites 35 "" 436 houses, again this is a remote site and doesn't impact existing residents. Site 36 "" Impacts heavily on New York and Murton Village existing residents. Sites 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40 should not be developed.</p> | | | <p>and the detailed planning process. A wide range of road and public transport improvements are programmed, or planned, for North Tyneside in order to tackle both current and future constraints in transport infrastructure - see Policy S10.3 and the IDP for further detail. This includes schemes to deliver improvements on the A191 corridor and accessibility to/from Cobalt Business Park and working with Nexus and public transport providers in order to identify need for new services and public transport links.</p> <p>Work is currently being undertaken as part of the Masterplan process in order to determine the most suitable location for providing land for ecological compensation relating to development at Station Road East, Wallsend (12/02025/FUL). A number of options are currently being explored, taking into account expert advice, to identify the most appropriate land to mitigate loss resulting from this permitted housing site.</p> <p>The Masterplan process will also take account of the precise details relating to flood risk and any ongoing works. An application for development will have to be accompanied by an assessment of flooding issues and, if necessary, propose measures to address and mitigate in order to make development acceptable. Information from relevant experts will be taken into account in considering these matters and the overall suitability of the site.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152247 | <p>Site 35-41: The site is sustainability located and well contained with excellent access and connectivity to the adjoining area. Taking all of the above into account, it is considered that the Local Plan has been produced in accordance with the policy requirements of the NPPF. The reasons for this are discussed in detail in the following section. The site is currently safeguarded land for future development as outlined in the adopted UDP. The SHLAA maps that have been produced since 2008/09 further reflect the site's excellent residential development credentials. The MSDA is allocated as safeguarded land within the adopted UDP. The site is now proposed to be identified as a strategic allocation site within the emerging Local Plan. The MDC consider this to be the correct policy approach and consider the delivery of this strategic site to be paramount to the successful delivery of the housing targets set by North Tyneside Council. The site is highly accessible by all modes of transportation. It is surrounded by key facilities and services alongside major employment areas. An opportunity exists to further enhance this connectivity by road and transport improvement. Initial discussions with NWL have concluded that there are no insurmountable drainage constraints posing a risk to</p> | Site 35 to 41 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>Support for development noted. As highlighted, a comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. This is being undertaken with the direct involvement of all key stakeholders, including landowners and statutory bodies, including the consultee, and will build on the work carried out to date relating to highway access, flooding and drainage, landscape and ecology.</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan identifying potential solutions to secure sustainable development of this area is included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. This Plan shows broad areas for wildlife, open space, facilities and potential development. Within these broad areas a wide range of issues and opportunities exist which will be considered further through detailed masterplanning.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>the delivery of residential development. The Masterplan is capable of meeting each requirement of Policy AS7.4 within the emerging Local Plan The proposed Masterplan is considered to represent a sustainable and logical form of development that will deliver the national and local policy objectives. The Murton Consortium are therefore in an unrivalled position to develop the Strategic Allocation site, which is considered to have no insurmountable barriers to development. This therefore presents and excellent opportunity to deliver a sustainable in line with Local and National policy criteria and will contribute to the housing targets of the Local Authority. The Murton Strategic Site can therefore be considered to represent a form of sustainable development This document [see attachment] demonstrates that sustainable and deliverable development can be achieved in line with the NPPF and most up to date local planning policy. This can be viably delivered with no insurmountable constraints affecting the site. The development of this site can make a significant contribution to delivering the boroughs housing need.</p> | | | | |
| 900308 | Places for People | | LP20151784 | <p>Site 69: We would emphasise the suitability of brownfield sites surrounding Smith's Dock for further development, as referred to in the</p> | Site 69 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation.</p> | <p>An indicative Concept Plan has been prepared for the Strategic Allocations setting out potential broad</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | Policies Map. Further investment would help maintain and strengthen values and promote vibrant and sustainable communities that have access to services and amenities. (Comments with input from Urban Splash) | | | | development areas, access arrangements, open space and wildlife corridors for the site. |
| 900308 | Places for People | | LP20151785 | Site 70: (Comments with input from Urban Splash) We would emphasise the suitability of brownfield sites surrounding Smith's Dock for further development, as referred to in the Policies Map. Further investment would help maintain and strengthen values and promote vibrant and sustainable communities that have access to services and amenities. | Site 70 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | An indicative Concept Plan has been prepared for the Strategic Allocations setting out potential broad development areas, access arrangements, open space and wildlife corridors for the site. |
| 900308 | Places for People | | LP20151786 | Site 74: We would emphasise the suitability of brownfield sites surrounding Smith's Dock for further development, as referred to in the Policies Map. Further investment would help maintain and strengthen values and promote vibrant and sustainable communities that have access to services and amenities. | Site 74 | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) and through this suggested allocation. | An indicative Concept Plan has been prepared for the Strategic Allocations setting out potential broad development areas, access arrangements, open space and wildlife corridors for the site. |
| | | RESIDENT | LP20152427 | Site 35 - 41: Murton I am opposed to the proposed road between New York and Earsdon. It will cut through the middle of a much used area and wildlife corridor, worryingly if it is to take a high volume of traffic it will be running close to a school. Also several footpaths cross the route between South Wellfield / Wellfield and Shiremoor linking houses and two | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Comments noted. A comprehensive Masterplan, in support of the strategic allocations policy, is being prepared to deliver the proposed strategic site at Murton, guiding development in a coherent, sustainable manner. As part of the Masterplan, an access and transport strategy will be necessary to identify the most suitable means of delivering the development, including measures to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | playing fields. Could existing roads be improved to cope with an increase in traffic rather than create a new one? | | | maximise the potential for walking, cycling and public transport use and which provide a connected, legible network of streets. Only on successful resolution of the issues related to transport infrastructure will development be considered acceptable. The most appropriate means of access, to this particular parcel and the wider development, will be a crucial aspect of this work. The improvements to the network associated with this site will also help to provide strategic solutions to wider transport issues and constraints. The master planning process will work to find a balance between housing, transport and green infrastructure needs. | |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP2015705 | Killingworth Moor: I agreed with the comments made and suggested to the officers a road could run from Holystone roundabout (A19) on to Killingworth Moor via a road bridge over the Metro line (a road bridge over the metro line is in the plan on the Murton site). This would give traffic direct access from the A19 on to the South East corner of Killingworth Moor. This was suggested in 1996 when the last local plan was under discussion. I attended a consultation meeting held by senior council officers who advocated the road from Holystone roundabout and said only a limited amount of Killingworth Moor could be developed as the smaller supporting road network was limited in traffic capacity. | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Comments noted. The potential impact of proposals upon the road network and junctions requiring improvement are assessed through traffic modelling work. Ongoing assessments will be undertaken of the required mitigation and phasing of new and enhanced infrastructure.` | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| 899469 | | | LP20151294 | These sites contain important wildlife corridors, esp. Murton which is a key corridor linking greenbelt land to the river and coast. It does not seem possible to reconcile a policy requirement to protect and enhance green infrastructure and wildlife corridors with plans for such major developments with all the associated transport infrastructure. | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Currently whilst the site provides an area of open land for wildlife, as largely farmed agricultural land the extent and value of that land for biodiversity is relatively limited. Whilst proposals for development will reduce the overall area of land that is open, a major opportunity exists to improve the quality of the remaining open land for wildlife and biodiversity value with provision of managed areas for wildlife free from intensive farming practices. With the addition, where necessary, of appropriate off site mitigation is also introduced the overall proposals can and will be required to maintain or potentially improve overall biodiversity value. | No amendments proposed |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151828 | As previously highlighted a number of recent planning applications have proposed direct deep drainage discharges of surface water to the bedrock. These have been particularly problematic at Algernon "" we welcome that the policy recognises deep drainage structures are unsuitable in this area. Mine water levels are currently actively managed across the Local Authority area. On this basis, we consider that such techniques do not provide a sustainable, long term solution due to rising groundwater levels reducing the storage capacity which may lead to groundwater flooding elsewhere. Discharges that concentrate the flow of effluent at one location and bypass some of the soil layers will limit the | Strategic Sites | AS 7.4 Strategic Site Allocations | Thank you for the information, we acknowledge that the ground conditions within North Tyneside mean that discharge into the ground is not always possible. | We have removed the asterisk from the policy and added the information into the supporting text. Whilst the information is important, to keep the policy brief we do not want to include all ground conditions within the policy. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | ability of the ground to attenuate pollutants and protect groundwater. Direct input into groundwater presents a significantly increased risk of pollution. We are seeking to stop cases where discharges are directly into the groundwater through wells, boreholes and shafts. The level of prior examination required to support a proposal to use a borehole may be significantly greater than required for near surface infiltration systems. An environmental permit may be required. On this basis, we would recommend that the asterisk highlights that deep drainage structures are unlikely to be suitable anywhere in the Authority area. | | | | |
| 463028 | | | LP201576 | 1. There may be a demand for housing in North Tyneside (or there may not), but that does not mean we have to meet the demand. We do not need to destroy all our green areas, which, in our case, were major a reason for moving to Holystone. If it becomes one giant suburb, people will not want to live here. 2. The council have allocated the northern parts of North Tyneside to Green Belt. Green belts normally separate areas of urban development, but in our case, we are separating ourselves from... the green expanses of Northumberland! I would much rather see a Green Heart to North Tyneside, instead of a pointless green belt. If we have to build on green land, let's develop the Green Belt, not the Green Heart. 3. The council should review the empty houses in the area | | DM 7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development | Comments noted. Local Planning Authorities are required by National Planning Policy to use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period (Para 47 of the NPPF). Paragraph 7 of the NPPF outlines that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. Paragraph 8 states that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are naturally dependant. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>and get them back into use. 4. We should only build on brown-field sites; there are many possibilities in North Tyneside, including the area around Norham Road. I do not think that areas 21, 24, 25, 26, 29 should be developed. Ideally areas 17 and 18 should also be left undeveloped. There has already been a very large amount of building in the Holystone area, including the Stonelea development West of the A19, the Murray Fields development East of the A19, the new houses near Moorview (North of Northumberland Park metro) and the new Forest Gate estate next to Palmersville metro. We should not build even more houses here. Local facilities are already strained, for example Holystone Primary School is already one of the largest in the area and is very over-subscribed. The Holystone Bypass (A191) is already very busy and almost impossible for pedestrians and cyclists to cross at peak times. This greenfield area is well used by walkers and cyclists and is one of the best reasons to live in our area. The extensive network of open spaces and wagon ways near Holystone promotes keeping fit. There are plenty of brown-field sites available, for example Norham Road (I think that is areas 77, 78, 106, 107 on the map). Another suitable site is the field behind Proctor and Gamble, between Whitley Road and the metro line. The derelict buildings near East Holywell could also be a site for houses. There is a very strong local feeling against further development in the Holystone area, as shown by the 3,500 signature petition handed to the council around 2012.</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 805554 | | | LP20151230 | Criteria to include "and no sites in-between Wallsend and Benton to be built upon"! - without this you are oppressing the communities of north wall send, Benton and Holystone and related areas by increasing traffic, removing green space, impacting wildlife, potential for flooding, overcrowding local schools and services etc . | | DM 7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development | Comments noted. This policy features a criteria to assess housing planning applications for those sites not included as allocations in the Local Plan. In those cases, applications will be judged on their own merits, in accordance with this policy and all others in the Plan. It is not in the interests of positive planning to have certain areas where those considerations do not apply. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899194 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | | LP20151648 | NWL is broadly supportive of the criteria within this policy. | | DM 7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151733 | 44. The HBF is generally supportive of this policy but refers the Council to our overarching comments against policy S7.3 above. | | DM 7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900308 | Places for People | | LP20151788 | (Comments with input from Urban Splash) We agree with North Tyneside's priorities for new developments (i.e. encourage a mix of uses, improve access and link with town centre and promote high quality design) and have taken these principles forward with the Smith's Dock development. | | DM 7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151800 | With reference to development principles more generally, further significance should be assigned to sustainable drainage and flood risk reduction within DM7.5, which presently lacks reference to either topic. This may be effectively integrated within point "d", which refers to the incorporation of appropriate green infrastructure provision, as indicated below: d. Make the best and most efficient use of available land, whilst incorporating appropriate green infrastructure provision and sustainable drainage systems within | | DM 7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development | This comment is noted. It is accepted that this criteria could potentially be included.... However the points identified within this policy are primarily identified at the specific approach to delivery new housing development. They do not address in detail the wide range of constraints such as biodiversity, heritage and environmental protect - including flood risk. Overall those policies throughout the plan ensure those matters are also addressed in managing future development proposals. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | | | development; and Inclusion at this point will highlight the links between sustainable drainage and green space, which are not always evident. Having said this, we do welcome the inclusion of a principle within DM7.5 which states that development must demonstrate that it can "be accommodated by, and make best use of, existing infrastructure, and where further infrastructure requirements arise, make appropriate contribution to its provision' (point "e'). | | | | |
| 396324 | Newcastle Airport | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151838 | The plan outlines future population growth and subsequent housing demand. We support the planar's aspiration to produce good quality housing stock to accommodate population forecasts, however, the impact of aircraft noise on potential new housing sites must be carefully considered. In developing new housing, there needs to be a balanced approach to identifying appropriate new sites alongside the continued operation of a major international airport. Current procedures at the Airport ensure that operations protect existing communities, with designated arrival and departure routes to avoid overflying residential areas where possible. The development of new dwellings under a flight path has potential to restrict airport options in terms of arrival and departure procedures. In considering the impact of aircraft noise on developments which may be noise sensitive such as housing, NIA has produced a set of noise contours, up to the period 2030, in line with our anticipated growth as outlined within our master plan. This process is | | DM 7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development | Comments noted - this matter will be clarified in the pre-submission draft. | To add. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | consistent with Government policy, as outlined within the Aviation Policy Framework which requires airports to continue to produce contours. While reference is made to noise pollution from aircraft, the airports noise contours do not appear to have been considered for the plan area, the contours not having been reproduced on the Policies Map. NIA would be happy to work with relevant officers to transpose the noise contours onto this map and then assess the proposed noise sensitive development allocations in relation to this, where required. | | | | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151944 | Natural England are pleased to see the support given to GI in this policy, although any new development that may affect Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar (alone or in combination) should comply with policy DM8.6 to ensure that it is compliant with the Habitats Regulations | | DM 7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development | Comment noted, this will be amended. | "This policy has been identified as having the potential to cause adverse impacts on internationally protected wildlife sites. When implemented, regard should be had to policy DM8.6 that sets out the requirement for appropriate avoidance or mitigation of, or compensation for, any adverse effects." added at para 7.47 |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152077 | RE New Site: Russell Square It is considered that our client's site would meet the criteria outlined in Policy DM7.5 to identify suitable sites for housing which are not included on the Policies Map. Development of the site would help to deliver the housing needs of the Borough, whilst making a positive contribution to the existing residential community at Seaton Burn. The site is | | DM 7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development | Comments noted. This site lies wholly in the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Assessment, which determined that the current extent of the Green Belt should be retained. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | accessible by sustainable modes of transport, including numerous bus services and the National Cycle Network, and would make effective use of existing infrastructure. As such, the suitability of our client's site for housing is evident, particularly as its inclusion in the Green Belt is unjustified. | | | | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152106 | RE New Site: Land to the south of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn. It is considered that our client's site would meet the criteria outlined in Policy DM7.5 to identify suitable sites for housing which are not included on the Policies Map. Development of the site would help to deliver the housing needs of the Borough, whilst making a positive contribution to the existing residential community at Seaton Burn. The site is accessible by sustainable modes of transport, including numerous bus services and the National Cycle Network, and would make effective use of existing infrastructure. As such, the suitability of our client's site for housing is evident and should therefore be removed from the Green Belt. | | DM 7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development | Comments noted. This site lies wholly in the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Assessment, which determined that the current extent of the Green Belt should be retained. | No amendments proposed. |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152134 | Re New Site: Land to south of Meadow Drive Seaton Burn. It is considered that our client's site would meet the criteria outlined in Policy DM7.5 to identify suitable sites for housing which are not included on the Policies Map. Development of the site would help to deliver the housing needs of the Borough, whilst making a positive contribution to the existing residential community at Seaton Burn. The site is accessible by sustainable modes of transport, including numerous bus services and the National Cycle Network, and would make effective use of existing infrastructure. | | DM 7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development | Comments noted. This site lies wholly in the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Assessment, which determined that the current extent of the Green Belt should be retained. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | As such, the suitability of our client's site for housing is evident and should therefore be removed from the Green Belt. | | | | |
| 458389 | | RESIDENT | LP201567 | (Ref Station Road) On the site given planning permission for Persimmon Homes, just how many homes are going to be at an affordable price. The sign up on the site suggests that they are building 5, 4, 3, 2 bedroom homes. How many of these are top end of market homes unaffordable I expect. I wonder?? | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | Comments noted. Comments are regarding a permitted application rather than the proposed policy. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890851 | | RESIDENT | LP2015166 | We are in great need of affordable housing for young people and families. | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | Policy DM7.6 (now Policy DM4.7) outlines the Councils affordable housing requirements for new housing developments. It states that in all but the most exceptional cases the Council will require affordable housing provision to be made on-site and remain affordable in perpetuity. | No amendments proposed. |
| 588278 | | RESIDENT | LP2015422 | Affordable and social housing should always be 'pepper potted' within developments to avoid stigmatisation. This will be opposed by developers due to perceptions that it makes other units more difficult to sell or of lower value. The wider socio economic benefits must be factored into these decisions. Ironically, social housing has defined space standards often greater than those preferred by commercial developers so this is also an opportunity, as my comments elsewhere, to impose National Space Standards on all developments. The fear that this could lead to developers investing elsewhere can be overcome by ensuring that there is a robust engagement with viability statements and a collaborative approach with other Planning Authorities to achieve a common goal. | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | Comment noted. As a starting principle the Council is keen to ensure every proposal over the threshold incorporates a proportion of affordable housing to ensure the creation of mixed communities. Within the sites, whilst a "pepper pot" approach is recognised as beneficial there are instances where management issues can arise if affordable homes are dotted across a large site. In these instances affordable homes are proposed in small pockets. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 894071 | | | LP2015450 | Housing, a decent, affordable home for everyone is paramount and shall be one of the main priorities of the council. The proposed "new council housing and homes by registered providers, 25% of all new homes being affordable" is too low. Increase to a minimum of 40% and give young families the opportunity and aspiration to have a decent home. | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | Comment noted. The Council is committed to ensuring affordable housing delivery and is pursuing its own programme for new affordable homes in addition to seeking provision as part of private led developments. However, the level of affordable homes sought must respond to the overall economic conditions and viability of development. Seeking too high an affordable need will simply hinder new development leading to fewer affordable homes being delivered overall. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015472 | We note North Tyneside's strategic aspirations and updated assessed needs for growth in policies S5.1-5.2, S6.1-6.3 and S7.1 (now S4.1)-7.2 plus DM7.6, including: i, -i, to build 16,632 net additional new homes between 2011/12-2031/32, at an overall average of 792 net additional new homes per annum and including at least 25% as affordable homes, working with Newcastle City Council and Northumberland County Council to jointly provide for North Tyneside's projected objectively assessed need over the plan period. | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151308 | DM7.6 Affordable Housing In November 2014 the Government amended the National Planning Policy Guidance and released a ministerial statement with respect to affordable housing and section 106 planning obligations. This avoids disproportionate developer contributions on small scale developments of 10 units or less which have a maximum combined gross floor space of 1,000 square metres. The guidance does not make provision for the inclusion of site | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | Reviewing the current national planning policy guidance the current policy approach in setting a threshold is not considered to be in conflict. The Local Plan is indicating that for schemes of 1 to 9 homes affordable housing will not be sought as a contribution from developers. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | thresholds, ID: 23b-012-20150326, Policy DM7.6 Affordable Housing should be amended to be in line with the recently issued guidance. In addition Criterion b) is unclear and is not in accordance with the NPPF (50) which states with regard to offsite contributions that these should be of "broadly equivalent value" the words "or greater than" should be deleted from Policy DM7.6 (b). The term "volume" is unclear as this implies "size", in addition it is inequitable to suggest that the greater "volumes" should be provided than would otherwise be viable as viability is clearly a material consideration in the determination of affordable housing provision and contributions. | | | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151348 | Policy DM7:6. Affordable housing: CPRE broadly supports this policy. The second paragraph is ambiguous unless it is intended that there are some exceptional circumstances when housing should not remain affordable in perpetuity. Consideration should be given to whether the percentage of affordable housing should be by number of houses or as a percentage of the developed footprint. There is a certain demand for affordable bungalows which would have a proportionately larger footprint than multi-storey housing. CPRE recommends that the policy specifies that any off-site affordable housing should be in the same community as the market housing site, and that if a commuted sum is accepted, a site for the affordable housing must be specified. Both these recommendations are intended to support community cohesion and balance. | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | Comment noted and scope for clarification agreed, | Reference to "in perpetuity" moved to opening paragraph regarding overall provision of affordable housing. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 899194 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | | LP20151649 | NWL considers that Policy DM7.6 should better reflect paragraph 50 of the NPPF, which states that "...policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of the changing market conditions over time."Furthermore national planning policy defines specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing (section 106 obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. As set out in the Written Ministerial Statement on small scale development, affordable housing contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floors pace of no more than 1000 sqm. Accordingly, NWL suggest the following changes to the policy: The Council will seek, where viable, 25% of all new homes to be affordable on new housing developments of 11 or more dwellings subject to specific site circumstances and economic viability. The affordable dwelling types and size should have regard to the needs set out in the most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The policy states at least 25% affordable housing will be required and that the Council will seek the maximum amount of affordable housing viably possible. NWL consider such a policy stance to be overly onerous and it provides limited certainty for developers, resulting in time consuming negotiations which could ultimately stall the delivery of housing in the district. The NPPF is clear that developers and land-owners are provided with competitive returns and the NPPG that the cumulative | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | The comment is noted. Overall the Council is required to set an overall viable proportion of affordable housing development for the plan period. This policy seeks to do that whilst acknowledging the specific viability of development - which may change both as a result of site circumstances and economic conditions at the time. The specific provisions of National Planning Guidance in relation to site thresholds is currently withdrawn. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | effect of obligations should not be set so high as to be at the margins of viability. In setting an affordable housing policy the Council must have regard to the cumulative viability impacts of all policies and obligations (NPPF paragraphs 173 to 177). NWL will reserve judgement upon whether the 25% affordable housing requirement is reasonable until the 2015 North Tyneside Area Wide Viability Assessment has been made available and the assumptions and inputs within it analysed. Furthermore, existing evidence base documents (2010 Affordable Housing Viability Assessment) suggest that when a 25% requirement is applied, almost none of the sites were viable. This problem is further exasperated when the cumulative effects of other proposed plan policies (such as those in relation to the sustainability credentials of new homes) are factored in. Based upon the available evidence NWL consider that the requirement for affordable housing should be reduced. In addition the policy should be re-worded to indicate that the target is an 'up to' target rather than 'at least'. | | | | |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151734 | 45. The policy remains the same as the previous consultation document with the exception that the site size threshold has been reduced to 10 units from 15. The HBFs original concerns relating to the requirement for at least 25% affordable housing on qualifying sites therefore still remains. 46. The HBF does not dispute the need for affordable housing, this is clearly demonstrated by the 2014 SHMA which identifies a net shortfall of 490units per annum. In setting an affordable | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | The comment is noted. Overall the Council is required to set an overall viable proportion of affordable housing development for the plan period. This policy seeks to do that whilst acknowledging the specific viability of development - which may change both as a result of site circumstances and economic conditions at the time. The specific provisions of National Planning Guidance in relation to site thresholds is currently withdrawn. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>housing policy the Council must have regard to the cumulative viability impacts of all policies and obligations (NPPF paragraphs 173 to 177). Unfortunately at the time of writing the 2015 North Tyneside Area Wide Viability Assessment was not available and as such these comments are based upon the earlier viability work. It is, however, noted that paragraph 7.55 of the plan suggests that a 25% affordable housing requirement to be reasonable. The HBF will reserve judgement upon this until the study as well as the assumptions and inputs have been fully considered. 47. The 2010 Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (AHVA) clearly illustrates viability issues across North Tyneside when a 25% requirement is applied. Table S1 of the AHVA indicates that at 25% almost none of the sites were viable. The viability issues are likely to be further compromised once the cumulative effects of other proposed plan policies and obligations and the governments push towards zero carbon homes are factored in. The NPPG is also clear that the plan must deliver in the first five years and that policies should not be based upon an expectation of future rises in value (at least in the first five years, ID 10-008-20140306). If the market improves sufficiently over the longer term the Council has the ability to amend its affordable housing target through a partial review of the plan. 48. The policy also suggests at least 25% affordable housing will be required and that the Council will seek the maximum amount of affordable housing viably possible. The HBF consider such a policy stance to be</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | unjustified. The policy as currently written would not provide any certainty for the development industry and is likely to stall developments through protracted negotiations. The NPPF is clear that developers and land-owners are provided with competitive returns and the NPPG that the cumulative effect of obligations should not be set so high as to be at the margins of viability. 49. Based upon the available evidence the HBF recommend that the requirement for affordable housing is reduced. In addition the policy should be re-worded to indicate that the target is an "up to' target rather than "at least'. | | | | |
| 808917 | BDW North East | LAND DEVELOPER | LP20151777 | The SHMAA "modelling suggests a net shortfall of 490 affordable dwellings each year across North Tyneside. Given that the councils proposed housing requirement is 792 dwellings per annum, 490 affordable dwellings per annum represents 62% of the overall yearly requirement. This figure is unlikely to be feasible. The council should increase its housing requirement to take account of the shortfall of affordable homes. NPPG para 29 states that "an increase in the total housing figures included in the local plan should be considered where it could help deliver the required number of affordable homes" (Ref ID: 2a-029-20140306). The council must provide for an uplift in housing requirement to provide for the identified need for affordable housing to take account of the shortfall of affordable homes. In policy DM7.6 affordable housing, the council states "to meet a Borough-wide target for at least | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | The comment is noted. Overall the Council is required to set an overall viable proportion of affordable housing development for the plan period. This policy seeks to do that whilst acknowledging the specific viability of development - which may change both as a result of site circumstances and economic conditions at the time. The specific provisions of National Planning Guidance in relation to site thresholds is currently withdrawn. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>25% of all new homes to be affordable, new housing developments of 10 or more dwellings, or on sites of 0.5ha or more, must include the maximum proportion of affordable housing taking into consideration specific site circumstances and economic viability" BDW note that the 25% target is high in comparison to those set in previous years. The only higher target was 30% in 2007, but this was at the peak of the housing market. The council must provide justification for this target. BDW recognises that the council plans to justify this in their "'North Tyneside Area Wide Viability Assessment'. However, this was not available as part of the consultation evidence base. The council has stated 8,560 households out of 91,295 households are in need, 9%. BDW urge the council to justify the 25% affordable housing target. The council must prove 25% remains a reasonable and viable target for housing delivery in North Tyneside. The council must also review the wording of the policy "'at least 25%...' and "' must include the maximum proportion of affordable housing taking into consideration specific site circumstances and economic viability" . BDW would urge the council to reword this policy to provide certainty to the developers on the amount of affordable housing required. Leaving it open to considerations of site specific circumstances and economic viability, may lead to ongoing negotiations, that effectively stall development, ultimately affecting the councils housing delivery. It is the council's responsibility to ensure their</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Local Plan is deliverable. Relying on developers to submit individual EVAs for each site is not considered sound. LPAs are not required to assess the viability of each site but they must demonstrate the viability of their plan through an EVA. The council itself, must ensure that the affordable housing target is deliverable, does not stall development and provides a competitive return to the landowner or developer. In accordance with the NPPF, para 173 the affordable housing requirement set must be viable and ensure sites are deliverable. "To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable" (NPPF, para 173). Viability of the 25% remains to be seen. BDW remain sceptical given that the 2010 Affordable Housing Viability Assessment demonstrated that at 25% affordable housing requirement almost none of the sites were viable. Any viability study undertaken by the council must also take account of the Government's push towards zero-carbon homes and the implications on build costs. Para 174 of the NPPF states that national standards must be considered in relation to the viability testing of the plan. The council must reword the policy to give certainty to developers of the target as a maximum being</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | sought by the council. BDW also urge the council to justify the affordable housing target and consider reviewing the 25% affordable housing target based to ensure it is viable and provides a competitive return to developer and landowner. The council must demonstrate the viability of the plan through an EVA. | | | | |
| 900308 | Places for People | | LP20151790 | (Comments with input from Urban Splash) A range of tenures are referred to as supporting a mixed community however there is no mention of Private Rental Sector which can meet a range of housing needs, particularly amongst young people who cannot yet afford to buy. | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | Comment noted. It is acknowledged that the private rented sector can make a positive contribution and additional wording has been added to the supporting text acknowledging this. however, within North Tyneside specific support for the delivery of private rented homes as a means of meeting a particular need in the borough is not considered necessary. | No amendments proposed |
| 769763 | Bellway Homes (NE) | DEVELOPER | LP20151927 | Bellway considers that Policy DM7.6 should better reflect paragraph 50 of the NPPF, which states that " ... policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of the changing market conditions over time."Furthermore national planning policy defines specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing (section 106 obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. As set out in the Written Ministerial Statement on small scale development, affordable housing contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floors pace of no more than 1000 sqm. The policy states at least 25% affordable housing will be required and that the Council will seek the maximum amount of affordable housing | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | The comment is noted. Overall the Council is required to set an overall viable proportion of affordable housing development for the plan period. This policy seeks to do that whilst acknowledging the specific viability of development - which may change both as a result of site circumstances and economic conditions at the time. The specific provisions of National Planning Guidance in relation to site thresholds is currently withdrawn. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>viably where possible. Bellway will reserve judgement upon whether the 25% affordable housing requirement is reasonable until the 2015 North Tyneside Area Wide Viability Assessment has been made available and the assumptions and inputs within it analysed. Furthermore, the policy should be re-worded to indicate that the target is an 'up to' target rather than 'at least'. Accordingly, Bellway suggest the following changes to the policy: The Council will seek, where viable, up to 25% of all new homes to be affordable on new housing developments of 11 or more dwellings subject to specific site circumstances and economic viability. The affordable dwelling types and size should have regard to the needs set out in the most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p> | | | | |
| 830576 | Taylor Wimpey | DEVELOPER | LP20151984 | <p>policy DM7.6 sets out the Council's preferred policy on affordable housing. As currently worded, the policy is objected to as it results in a level of uncertainty for developers seeking to invest within the Borough. There are two principle concerns with the policy, firstly that the policy does not confirm what the maximum affordable housing contribution to be sought by the Council will be, and secondly the policy has not been subjected to an up to date viability assessment and it is unknown whether the policy will jeopardise the delivery of the plan objectives. On the first point, subject to confirming viability, the policy should confirm a maximum of 25% affordable housing. The maximum affordable housing provision within the policy should be</p> | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | <p>The comment is noted. Overall the Council is required to set an overall viable proportion of affordable housing development for the plan period. This policy seeks to do that whilst acknowledging the specific viability of development - which may change both as a result of site circumstances and economic conditions at the time. The specific provisions of National Planning Guidance in relation to site thresholds is currently withdrawn.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|---------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | informed by an up to date viability assessment, before the plan can progress. Taylor Wimpey welcome the clarification within the policy that individual site circumstances, including economic viability, will be considered by the Council. | | | | |
| 900788 | | DEVELOPER | LP20151993 | Our client considers that Policy DM7.6 should be amended to better reflect paragraph 50 of the NPPF in order to ensure that sufficient flexibility is afforded to adapt to changing market conditions. In order to ensure greater consistency with paragraph 50 of the NPPF, it is considered that Policy DM7.6 should be amended so that it does not set a minimum target for the Borough, as well as removing the requirement to provide the maximum amount of affordable housing viably possible. The policy should be re-worded as follows: The Council will seek 25% of all new homes to be affordable, new housing developments of 10 or more dwellings, or on sites of 0.5ha or more, subject to specific circumstances and economic viability. The affordable dwelling types and size should have regard to the needs set out in the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment. | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | The comment is noted. Overall the Council is required to set an overall viable proportion of affordable housing development for the plan period. This policy seeks to do that whilst acknowledging the specific viability of development - which may change both as a result of site circumstances and economic conditions at the time. The specific provisions of National Planning Guidance in relation to site thresholds is currently withdrawn. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANT | LP20152008 | The figure of 25% affordable housing is challenging when compared with Newcastle, Gateshead, Stockton and Durham. In this context the wording of the policy should be changed. It starts off by saying the target is "at least 25%" and then states that developments "must include the maximum proportion of affordable housing" . There is no maximum " there is a minimum of 25%. We do not believe that "at least" targets | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | The target for delivery of at least 25% affordable homes is a borough wide target to meet the boroughs overall needs. This reflects the fact that housing is delivered by private developers - but schemes are also regularly brought forward in north tyneside by RPs themselves and increasingly the Council. In such circumstances affordable housing delivery is frequently if not exclusively 100% of the overall scheme. It is | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | work well in practice. There is no obvious reason why any developer would ever exceed the requirement unless it was a rural exception site or inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Under this policy off-site provision (via a commuted sum) would only be allowed in the "most exceptional circumstances" . This appears to be unnecessarily inflexible. Removal of the word "most" would give the council more latitude to achieve the best outcomes for provision in the Borough. The first two criteria for off-site provision seem acceptable but the third does not make any sense and should be removed. It could be re-phrased to say that if it is agreed that the criteria for off-site provision are met then the commuted sum will be calculated to be the equivalent of on-site provision. | | | therefore consistent with our overall needs, evidence of viability and understanding of delivery that the target for the plan should be at least 25%. For the specific delivery of affordable housing on any given site the Council will seek to maximise the amount of affordable housing that can be delivered without compromising the viability of that developemnt - and with regard to any other development contributions necessary to make the scheme meet the minimum requirements for sustainable development. | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152039 | Policy DM7.6 sets the Council's target for affordable housing at 25%. Persimmon Homes consider this to be an appropriate level to be viably delivered within the authority. The wording of the policy however sets this as a minimum target for affordable housing. While we don't refute the need for affordable housing within the plan period policies such as affordable housing need to ensure viable development in order for the plan's key aims to be achieved. Wording such as this does not provide the development industry with sufficient comfort to ensure viable development. We propose that the wording of this policy is changed to state "up to 25% affordable Housing" rather than "At least" . | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | The target for delivery of at least 25% affordable homes is a borough wide target to meet the boroughs overall needs. This reflects the fact that housing is delivered by private developers - but schemes are also regularly brought forward in north tyneside by RPs themselves and increasingly the Council. In such circumstances affordable housing delivery is frequently if not exclusively 100% of the overall scheme. It is therefore consistent with our overall needs, evidence of viability and understanding of delivery that the target for the plan should be at least 25%. For the specific delivery of affordable housing on any given site the Council will seek to maximise the amount of affordable housing that can be delivered | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | without compromising the viability of that developemnt - and with regard to any other development constributions necessary to make the scheme meet the minimum requirements for sustainable development. | |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152078 | RE New Site: Russell Square. Our client considers that Policy DM7.6 should be amended to better reflect paragraph 50 of the NPPF in order to ensure that sufficient flexibility is afforded to adapt to changing market conditions. Although the site threshold has been reduced from 15 units to 10, the policy remains fundamentally unchanged from the previous . In order to ensure greater consistency with paragraph 50 of the NPPF, it is considered that Policy DM7.6 should be amended so that it does not set a minimum target for the Borough, as well as removing the requirement to provide the maximum amount of affordable housing viably possible. The policy should be re-worded as follows: [ADD The Council will seek][REMOVE To meet a Borough wide target for at least] 25% of all new homes to be affordable, new housing developments of 10 or more dwellings, or on sites of 0.5ha or more, [REMOVE must include the maximum proportion of affordable housing taking into consideration] [ADD subject to] specific circumstances and economic viability. [ADD The affordable dwelling types and size should have regard to the needs set out in the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.] | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the SHLAA (Site 148). The SHLAA currently concludes that this site is unsuitable for residential development. A Green Belt Review, undertaken to support the Local Plan, concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident, as required by NPPF, to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | No amendments proposed. |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152137 | RE New Site: Land to the south of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn. Our client considers that | | DM 7.6 Affordable | This site is located within the North Tyneside Green Belt and is assessed in the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>Policy DM7.6 should be amended to better reflect paragraph 50 of the NPPF in order to ensure that sufficient flexibility is afforded to adapt to changing market conditions. Although the site threshold has been reduced from 15 units to 10, the policy remains fundamentally unchanged from the previous . In order to ensure greater consistency with paragraph 50 of the NPPF, it is considered that Policy DM7.6 should be amended so that it does not set a minimum target for the Borough, as well as removing the requirement to provide the maximum amount of affordable housing viably possible. The policy should be re-worded as follows: [ADD The Council will seek] [REMOVE To meet a Borough wide target for at least] 25% of all new homes to be affordable, new housing developments of 10 or more dwellings, or on sites of 0.5ha or more,[REMOVE must include the maximum proportion of affordable housing taking into consideration][ADD subject to] specific circumstances and economic viability. [ADD The affordable dwelling types and size should have regard to the needs set out in the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.]</p> | | Housing | SHLAA (Site 308). A Review has been undertaken to support the Local Plan, this concludes that there are currently no exceptional circumstances evident to require the release of Green Belt land for development. Therefore, the Local Plan confirms that this land will remain designated as Green Belt over the plan period. | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152161 | <p>Policy DM7.6- an additional criterion for assessing whether or not affordable housing should be provided on site should be the extent to which doing so might cause harm to any heritage assets on or otherwise affected by the development. Harm may take the form of compromises with regard to historic fabric or issues surrounding viability.</p> | | DM 7.6 Affordable Housing | Comments noted. The Local Plan is read as a whole. The relevant Heritage Assets and Historic Environment policies provide sufficient guidance on the management of heritage assets. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| 892874 | | RESIDENT | LP2015301 | Prioritise Council house provision | | S 7.7 Delivering New Council Homes | Policy S7.7 (now DM4.7) supports the delivery of new affordable and council owned homes. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893913 | | | LP2015417 | My Greatest concern is the over development by the council building excess properties that cause house prices to de-value. | | S 7.7 Delivering New Council Homes | Comment noted. Please be aware that under national planning policy, house value and price is not a planning consideration. Policy DM9.2 (now S6.1) states that development will only be permitted where it demonstrates high and consistent design standards. | No amendments proposed. |
| 588278 | | RESIDENT | LP2015423 | Presumably Council owned homes will be sponsored by the Council so we should expect a much more pro-active and robust approach than mere "support". | | S 7.7 Delivering New Council Homes | As S7.7 (now incorporated into DM4.7) states 'Proposals for the delivery of new affordable and council owned homes, that would make a contribution towards North Tyneside's overall assessed needs for affordable housing will be supported'. | will need to amend policy numbers so they correlate |
| 792546 | | RESIDENT | LP2015798 | I also feel strongly that North Tyneside Council homes for rent should also be built on the following "Large Sites with Planning Permission": Edge of Gosforth Wood, Both Sites on the edge of Rising Sun Country Park alongside A186, Both Sites off A1058 near Holy Cross and Richardson Dees Park, Darsley Park, Benton, Forest Hall, Longbenton and Hadrian Park. | | S 7.7 Delivering New Council Homes | Comments noted. As stated these sites already have planning permission and cannot be amended. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151349 | Policy S7:7 Council Homes: The provision of council homes must be subject to the same criteria as other new housing development, i.e. Policy DM7:6 should apply to Policy S7:7 | | S 7.7 Delivering New Council Homes | Comments noted. Council homes must follow the criteria outlined. | No amendments proposed. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152040 | Policy S7.7 sets out the Council's intentions to deliver between 2500 and 3000 new affordable Council houses. This policy is an interesting and quite un-precedent step towards social housing within the local authority. Persimmon Support this in principle | | S 7.7 Delivering New Council Homes | The Council has established a clear commitment to securing the delivery of affordable homes and is determined to drive efforts to meet the needs of the Boough through the use of its own land, and working positively and pro-actively with | This policy has been integrated within the general affordable homes policy. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | however has concerns relating to the delivery, evidence that this policy rises. We would ask that the Council provide further details on how this policy will be delivered in practice and to clearly show where, how and when these houses will be provided to ensure the policy holds up under future scrutiny. In addition to the above we would these 2500 "" 3000 houses be included in the overall 16632 new homes within the plan period / included in policy S7.3? if so the delivery of these sites is questioned as no evidence of their economic viability and further evidence of funding is available. Given the level of scrutiny that policies are under during an EIP we would advise that specific evidence base is produced to support this. | | | developers and registered providers. The overall delivery of homes will be art of the overall objectively assessed needs for homes which are described as a minimum. | |
| 891068 | | RESIDENT | LP2015197 | Build flats instead of individual housing! or terraces of housing. | | DM 7.8 Range of Housing Size | The Council has commissioned a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that provides evidence on the tenures and sizes of homes that will be required in the Borough. Information from the SHMA (and its future revisions) will be used to ensure housing delivery has regard to the requirements of all household types and sizes. | No amendments proposed. |
| 588278 | | RESIDENT | LP2015419 | There is no reference to the opportunity provided by the National Housing Standards Review which has devolved the setting of spatial standards in new housing to Local Authorities. You will be aware of this and the fact that house size in England is significantly smaller than elsewhere in Europe. The standard arguments against imposing space standards in Local Plans are that they increases house prices and also that Councils | | DM 7.8 Range of Housing Size | Comments noted. A new policy will be introduced that reflects new Government requirements for housing standards, including making homes accessible and adaptable. | New policy "Housing Standards" added. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | are not equipped or willing to challenge developers' viability statements. The first point is based on a linear cost/m2 approach to design and construction which is not necessary and should be challenged so that innovative projects are encouraged and supported. Recent legal judgements have empowered Councils to require full commercial data underpinning viability statements, ensuring that they can be forensically and successfully challenged. | | | | |
| 588278 | | RESIDENT | LP2015425 | The National Housing Standards Review provides the opportunity for Local Authorities to set spatial standards for housing. This opportunity should not be missed. Houses in England are significantly smaller than elsewhere in Europe, as demonstrated by the RIBA in it Space and Light research submitted to the Review. The argument that the market needs smaller starter homes at affordable prices should be turned into a challenge to developers to stop thinking in a linear fashion about Â£/m2 and be much more innovative about the way they deliver housing. This could be by providing shell units for completion using sweat equity etc for example. Design codes would assist with this. Elsewhere I have pointed out that the fear of investment going elsewhere, to areas which do not impose space standards should be challenged through robust and forensic responses to viability statements. | | DM 7.8 Range of Housing Size | Comments noted. A new policy will be introduced that reflects new Government requirements for housing standards, including making homes accessible and adaptable. | New policy "Housing Standards" added. |
| 467822 | | RESIDENT | LP2015869 | Caravans can be used as a good home for mum and dads with one or two kids and maybe a dog and a cat. Site with bar and shop and a pool maybe sea water. | | DM 7.8 Range of Housing Size | Caravans are not considered suitable family homes. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 899194 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | | LP20151650 | NWL support the amendments to the policy to make it less prescriptive and to provide flexibility in enabling housing needs to be met in accordance with paragraph 14 of NPPF (which confirms that "Local plans should meet objectively assessed needs with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.") The 2014 SHMA, or any successor document, provides the most up to date information and should be used to provide the context for the range of housing provided. It is, however, important that these documents alone do not dictate the mix of housing on individual sites. NWL recommend that issues of market demand, site constraints and market demand are also important considerations and that this should be included within the wording of the policy. | | DM 7.8 Range of Housing Size | This comment is noted, policy on the mix and type of housing provision has been amended. The purpose of the policy is to provide a guide to housing delivery that has regard to the latest available evidence - in particular that included within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. This is in keeping with the requirements of national policy. The policy does not however specifically require that individual developments should match the housing mix set out within the SHMA with this open to applicants to propose a housing mix for development that meets their requirements for commercial viability. | No amendments proposed. |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151735 | 50. The HBF supports the removal of the prescriptive requirements from this policy which were included in the previous consultation, this reflects some of our previous concerns with the policy. 51. It is recognised that the 2014 SHMA, or successor document, provides the most up to date information and should be used to provide a plan-wide context for the range of housing provided. It is, however, important that these documents alone do not dictate the mix of housing on individual sites. The HBF recommend that issues of viability, market demand and site characteristics are also considerations. This could either be included in the policy or background text. The Council will also need to be careful that the policy does not conflict with policy DM7.10 Large | | DM 7.8 Range of Housing Size | This comment is noted, policy on the mix and type of housing provision has been amended. The purpose of the policy is to provide a guide to housing delivery that has regard to the latest available evidence - in particular that included within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. This is in keeping with the requirements of national policy. The policy does not however specifically require that individual developments should match the housing mix set out within the SHMA with this open to applicants to propose a housing mix for development that meets their requirements for commercial viability. The comment in relation to potential conflict with positive support for executive housing is also noted - however, given the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | Executive Housing. | | | means of implementation of both policies and the identification of a demand for larger homes within the current SHMA there is not considered to be a fundamental conflict. | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152041 | Policy DM7.8 is supported and considered logical and grounded in evidence. | | DM 7.8 Range of Housing Size | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151309 | DM7.9 Self Build Policy DM7.9 Self Build is general supported as acknowledging the increased demand for this type of home in line with government aspirations. However, the inclusion of "encouragement to consider' on sites of 200 homes the inclusion of 10% of a sites net developable area for self-build appears to be arbitrary and unjustified. The SHMA 2014 makes reference to self-build but simply reiterates the Council's intent rather than provided detailed evidence for this. This part of policy DM7.9 should be deleted from the policy. | | DM 7.9 Self Build | Comment noted... the Council remain keen to encourage custom and self build development and the provision of land that for such construction is a key constraint to its delivery. Making room for custom and self build development within larger residential development proposals is therefore a key opportunity. However, it is acknowledged that specific reference to a 10% land area does not add greatly to achieving the overall objective. | Policy amended to read, "For housing developments over 200 homes the Council will encourage applicants to consider (where economically viable) opportunities to set aside a proportion of the site's net developable area for custom and self build housing development." |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151350 | Policy DM7:9. Self Build: CPRE supports this policy. | | DM 7.9 Self Build | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151736 | 52. The policy seeks to achieve at least 10% of a sites net developable area for self-build plots on sites of 200 or more. The achievement of such a requirement would have significant implications upon the viability of the site and on this basis may restrict developments coming forward. It is therefore recommended that the final paragraph be deleted. | | DM 7.9 Self Build | Comment noted... the Council remain keen to encourage custom and self build development and the provision of land that for such construction is a key constraint to its delivery. Making room for custom and self build development within larger residential development proposals is therefore a key opportunity. However, it is acknowledged that specific reference to a 10% land area does not add greatly to achieving the overall objective. | Policy amended to read, "For housing developments over 200 homes the Council will encourage applicants to consider (where economically viable) opportunities to set aside a proportion of the site's net developable area for custom and self build housing development." |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANT | LP20152009 | We applaud the aspiration of delivering 10% of new units through self-build mechanism. This is an aspiration which we share. It is nonetheless challenging from a very low base. It would be important to identify a part of a site and a phase of development which lent itself to self-build. It might be possible to incentivise this phase by ensuring that they did not trigger financial contributions or affordable housing targets. It might be advisable to also allow custom-build homes within policy DM7.9. | | DM 7.9 Self Build | Comment noted... the Council remain keen to encourage custom and self build development and the provision of land that for such construction is a key constraint to its delivery. Making room for custom and self build development within larger residential development proposals is therefore a key opportunity. However, it is acknowledged that specific reference to a 10% land area does not add greatly to achieving the overall objective. | Policy amended to read, "For housing developments over 200 homes the Council will encourage applicants to consider (where economically viable) opportunities to set aside a proportion of the site's net developable area for custom and self build housing development." |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152042 | Policy DM7.9 sets out the Council's approach towards self build properties. Persimmon has explored this market and are one of the only national developers currently utilising this approach within the North East. We do not object to this policy on the principle as including "support" self build properties however this policy goes too far in requiring self build on sites over a certain threshold, as such we strongly object to the policy as worded. We question the grounds on which Council are trying to insist that any scheme over 200 units which came forward that did not include a self build element. It seems unclear how a decision maker would apply this policy and seems to suggest that the only argument available would be one of economic viability which is overly onerous and completely unjustified. | | DM 7.9 Self Build | Comment noted... the Council remain keen to encourage custom and self build development and the provision of land that for such construction is a key constraint to its delivery. Making room for custom and self build development within larger residential development proposals is therefore a key opportunity. However, it is acknowledged that specific reference to a 10% land area does not add greatly to achieving the overall objective. | Policy amended to read, "For housing developments over 200 homes the Council will encourage applicants to consider (where economically viable) opportunities to set aside a proportion of the site's net developable area for custom and self build housing development." |
| 893716 | | RESIDENT | LP2015347 | Just a note to say how strongly I support the designation of the Benton curve (adjacent to the Oval in NE12) as a wildlife corridor. I am so pleased the local authority has recognised the environmental value of this land and I'm | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | sure I speak on behalf of all the local residents who would hate to see it developed in any way. | | | | |
| 893910 | | RESIDENT | LP2015367 | I would like to register our strong support of the designation of the above disused railway line [Disused railway adjoining The Oval and North Avenue Benton] known as Benton Curve as a wildlife corridor as put forward in the new North Tyneside Local Plan. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893914 | | RESIDENT | LP2015369 | I would like to express my support for the proposal to designate the old railway track known as the Benton South West Curve as a wildlife corridor. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 472648 | | RESIDENT | LP2015399 | We should like to place on record our strong support for the North Tyneside Council's designation of the Benton Curve disused railway line as a wildlife corridor. With the huge proliferation of building on almost all of the local green field areas (completed, under construction & proposed) this section is part of one of the few remaining wildlife routes into & out of the Rising Sun Country Park, which is rapidly being isolated by the developments encircling it. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894349 | | RESIDENT | LP2015405 | I wish to strongly support the designation of the Benton Curve as a wildlife corridor - my husband is of the same opinion. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894349 | | RESIDENT | LP2015406 | I wish to strongly support the designation of the Benton Curve as a wildlife corridor. I am aware that this area is losing many of its green spaces for housing but we must protect the wildlife. It will diminish greatly if said wildlife is confined to smaller and smaller areas and unable to move from one area to another freely and safely. As a resident of the area concerned, I hope that the local wildlife will | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | be enjoyed for many years to come - and the only way forward is to protect what we have before it is too late. | | | | |
| 894634 | | RESIDENT | LP2015429 | I have lived at 10 The Oval, Benton for 50 years and my house is directly opposite the disused railway line. I was extremely happy to learn that there was potential for the re-designation of the Benton Curve as a wildlife corridor. In this day and age of housing etc it is refreshing to think that the council would like to designate this land in this way. Any other development of this land would be hugely disruptive and in my view totally unacceptable. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015505 | Paragraph 8.18 The Northumberland Wildlife Trust welcomes the recognition that those ecological features outside of designated sites provide important and invaluable contributions to local biodiversity. This statement remains current. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898437 | | RESIDENT | LP2015800 | I am writing to express my strong support of the local authority in achieving the designation for the disused railway at the Benton Curve, as a wildlife corridor. The need for the appreciation of wildlife in our local area is highly important. The children in the area love to watch the birds and with the sight of the odd fox and plenty of little hedgehogs, causes much excitement. There is little enough for our children to get excited about, in these troubled times and the loss of such a lovely bit of nature would be devastating to our little community here in Benton. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. | No amendments proposed |
| 468254 | | RESIDENT | LP2015811 | I am writing to applaud the decision of the Council to protect the Benton Curve and | | Biodiversity and | Support noted. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | adjoining field from possible housing development which would be wholly inappropriate in this conservation area. Furthermore the curve is a valuable wildlife corridor greatly appreciated by local residents. | | Geodiversity | | |
| 898546 | | | LP2015837 | The proposed 'wildlife corridor' at the disused railway in Benton is a good idea. Firstly, that area of railway may end up being reused for its original intention one day. This is one reason why it should not be built on now. In the meantime, it provides a secluded area for wildlife to go. The airport may one day wish to reuse the land as a link between the mainline and the metro or for some similar purpose. I strongly support the use of the Benton curve as a wildlife corridor. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898969 | | | LP2015996 | Is the council going to support local farms with protecting and enhancing biodiversity, so species such a Corn Bunting, Turtle Dove can return and be safeguarded, whilst protecting populations of Yellowhammers and Barn Owls? The form two species were once common throughout the UK including the North Tyneside region, whilst continuing development such as housing is threatening the current range of the latter two species. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Policy DM5.5 (was DM8.5) 'Managing effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity' include all types of species, flora and fauna. It states that 'All development proposals should: a. Protect the biodiversity and geodiversity value of land, species and buildings and minimise fragmentation of habitats and wildlife links; and b. maximise opportunities for creation, restoration, enhancement, management and connection of natural habitats; and C. incorporate beneficial biodiversity and geodiversity conservation features providing net gains to biodiversity unless otherwise shown to be appropriate. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898573 | | | LP20151053 | I urge the council and planning officers to maintain the Wildlife corridors at Benton Curve and Benton triangle for the animals birds and plants that inhabit and use those | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Benton Curve and Triangle are not included in this of the Local Plan as suggested development sites and are proposed to be retained as green space. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | areas. | | | | |
| 898964 | | | LP20151068 | 3. I could not find anything in the plan that explained the wildlife corridors properly. Looking at the map some of these cross dense housing areas. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comment noted. North Tyneside Local Plan is also supported by a suite of evidence based documents. The North Tyneside Green Infrastructure Strategy provides more detail on Wildlife Corridors and can be found at http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/pls/portals/NTC_PSCM.PSCM_Web.download?p_ID=559143 . Alternatively if you wish to view a paper copy residents are also welcome to come and view the document at our council office. | No amendments proposed. |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151102 | These comments are for S8.4 but the 'Add' button didn't work Green Party The proposed development of the land at Murton and scale of land allocated does not seem to support the requirement to give priority achieving the objectives and targets set out in the Biodiversity Action Plan, in particular in relation to the identified target area Murton within the BAP for creation and enhancement of up to 5 linear kilometres of Scrub & Hedgerow, and up to 10ha of new native scrub/ shrub land. The proposed development plot infringes on an identified wildlife corridor which is designated as a priority transport route. 8 acres of the Murton plot is already set-aside to be retained as un-developed grassland and wetland area under a planning obligation to provide offset habitat for a development elsewhere in the borough. Areas of this offset land are also infringed by the proposed development, particularly priority transport infrastructure. The plan does not | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. North Tyneside Council is aware that a number of constraints exist on site and does not expect the whole of the site to be developed. As shown in Policy AS7.4 (now S4.4), North Tyneside Council will ensure a master plan is created for the strategic site allocations in order to ensure that development not only meets a housing need but also enhances biodiversity and geodiversity. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | identify or accept the existence of this land at all. It is imperative that the unavailability of this land is made clear in the development plan, and that any development proposal is considered in light of this land. | | | | |
| 899433 | | | LP20151265 | I am responding on behalf of my husband and myself. Firstly, we very much welcome the decision to remove the Benton Triangle site (previously site 14) from the list of potential development areas. Satisfactory vehicular access to this area would be virtually impossible to arrange. Also, this area is a valuable "breathing space" which is well-liked by local residents (including ourselves) and we are excited about the recent plans by local residents to develop it further as a community resource. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| | | | LP20152233 | Wildlife corridor and fields used by many dog walkers and horse riders. | | Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898219 | | | LP2015816 | There will be more chance of flooding; (we were flooded in 2012). | | Flood Risk | Comment noted. National and Local Policy prevent from any increase in flood risk. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805689 | | | LP2015896 | Having reluctantly accepted that new housing will likely be built behind my estate, I would simply ask that all flood defence - and other infrastructure planning is agreed and budgeted for (whether by developers or taxpayers) before a single sod of earth is lifted. | | Flood Risk | National and Local Policy prevent from any increase in flood risk. A Flood Risk Assessment will be produced for all major housing development. This will include plans for any flood prevention works required with the new development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805543 | | | LP20151088 | Flooding has been grossly underestimated by council officials and effectively swept under the carpet. The policy of covering North Tyneside with bricks will result in monumental flooding in Wallsend and adjacent areas. | | Flood Risk | Comment noted. National and Local Policy prevent from any increase in flood risk. The Council will also continue to work with stakeholders like Northumbrian Water, the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority to continue to focus on flood reduction works and surface water | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | separation schemes. | |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151802 | Our general response to this section is that it would be beneficial to combine, or at the least cross-reference, the content of Water Management in Section 10 with that contained in the Flood Risk section. We understand that North Tyneside Council considers that water management has a place within the wider topic of infrastructure, but it is our opinion that flooding should not be entirely separate from water management due to the inherent linkages between the topics. For example, upon reading the current document, the reader would read the policy and supporting text on flood risk and take from it limited reference to sustainable drainage. It is our opinion that the current structure does not form a particularly user-friendly document with regard to water management. | | Flood Risk | Comment noted, agree that amendments are required. | Two water sections have been combined into one Water Environment chapter. |
| 805252 | | RESIDENT | LP201544 | I agree that North Tyneside should have a robust plan to preserve what little green or open space we have left and God forbid we have developers trying to build on greenbelt land. I understand that having this plan will give the Council more power to counter the house builders demands. It has got to stop somewhere. The houses that are being built are out of the price range of most people anyway. The only green oasis is Gosforth Park nature reserve which I visit frequently but I fear even that is not safe. We won't have any wildlife left if it cannot move around the area. And the term wildlife corridor is often used to refer to a belt of rough ground 20 metres | | Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. The Local Plan encourages the use of brownfield land and contains many potential development sites on brownfield land. However evidence on population growth and housing needs means that we also need to look towards sustainable greenfield sites. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | wide. This will be the case at East Benton Rise and that's only because there are pylons in the way. I know people have got to live somewhere but brownfield sites should and must be considered first. Please do everything you can to stop the indiscriminate building and to preserve what is referred to as our heritage by giving us some places where we can enjoy the open air in relative peace and quiet without having to travel out of the area for miles. | | | | |
| 894366 | | RESIDENT | LP2015390 | We would like to support the councils plan to re-designate the disused railway at the Oval and North avenue (Benton curve) into a wildlife corridor | | Green Infrastructure | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894370 | | RESIDENT | LP2015391 | I'm writing in support of the new North Tyneside council plan to designate the disused railway line (Benton Curve) as a wildlife corridor. As a resident in the area 15 The Grove NE12 9PE I am acutely area of the mass of development happening in our area and the need to preserve areas for recreation and greenery for future generations. Please could you register this preference which many residents in the area would be in agreement with . | | Green Infrastructure | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 894375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015398 | The Benton Curve Disused Railway Line: This disused railway line has been owned by the Airport Authority for a number of years on the understanding that it would be maintained as a wildlife corridor. It is now well established as such but suggestions that the line may now be sold off for development is totally unacceptable ,this must not be allowed to happen especially when local residents can see what a marked improvement there has | | Green Infrastructure | This site has been removed from our list of proposed housing development sites. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | been on the wildlife since its designation. The line must be maintained in its current form regardless of ownership. | | | | |
| 805471 | | | LP20151126 | A wildlife corridor should be maintained however the building of huge estates at either side of this and also next to the Rising Sun country park will impact negatively on this by encroachment and traffics both footfall and vehicular. | | Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. Although some designated sites have wildlife corridors running through them there is no reason to consider why these sites could not accommodate future development whilst adhering to the policies and maintaining a linked workable network of wildlife corridors. | No amendments proposed. |
| 472456 | | RESIDENT | LP20151400 | Proposed wildlife corridors are not based on sound assessment and are compromised by planned development and new roads. They do not meet NPPF requirements for establishing coherent ecological networks. | | Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. There is no definitive methodology for producing a Borough ecological network map. However we have drawn heavily on external resources, including National Planning Policy and Natural England's work. Alongside the Local Plan a number of additional evidence based studies and guides have been developed, including the North Tyneside Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). As part of this strategy North Tyneside's Wildlife corridors have been reviewed following significant changes in the landscape since the previous GI strategy and UDP. In order to produce North Tyneside's Wildlife Enhancement Corridors (WEC), for | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>the emerging Local Plan it is essential that a baseline map with all existing green space was produced. This is in line with Natural England's recommendations for opportunity mapping and habitat networks. Working with organisations and individuals in particular with North Tyneside's Ecologist, existing designated sites and valuable habitats were first mapped on GIS. Clusters of habitats and sites which form the core wildlife areas for the Borough were then identified. This then led onto plotting network links between the core areas. Potential buffers, links and stepping stones were created to produce large habitat areas, and to create a functional wildlife network. Outside the network, wildlife habitats and sites will continue to be managed and protected, and can be buffered by habitat creation and appropriate management. It is recognised that the additional development proposed in the Local Plan could have indirect impacts on biodiversity and the use of open space for recreation. In preparing site allocations, North Tyneside Council has considered the potential impact of each site allocation on biodiversity and green spaces assets. Where new development occurs North Tyneside Council will seek on or off-site provision resulting from recreational pressure on existing Green Infrastructure sites, when practical. Although some designated sites have wildlife corridors running through them there is no reason to consider why these sites could not accommodate future development whilst</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | adhering to the policies and maintaining a linked workable network of wildlife corridors. | |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151801 | Within commentary surrounding green infrastructure, we believe that there is the opportunity for further reference to be made to sustainable drainage and its potential to be an integral part of green infrastructure. This would enable green infrastructure to provide further benefits in the form of improved water quality and reduced flood risk, whilst continuing to deliver the additional benefits that are more prominent within the supporting text of this section, such as amenity value and biodiversity enhancement. It is our belief that the concept of green infrastructure must include notions of sustainable drainage, and that in reality the two cannot be truly separate. We therefore suggest that this section is revisited with a view to adding greater emphasis to these linkages. | | Green Infrastructure | The water policies have been moved and grouped together in order to provide further clarity and strengthen the policies. The Green infrastructure Strategy which sits alongside the Local Plan has also been amended and updated. | Amendments made. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152163 | In dealing with the issue of Green Infrastructure, it should be borne in mind that many components of it are heritage assets in their own right, such as the area's waggonways. | | Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. Information will be added. | "Many components of the green infrastructure network provide a setting to heritage assets or are heritage assets in their own right, such as the area's waggonways." added to para 8.2 (now para 8.3). |
| 901309 | Council for British Archaeology North | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152216 | We are supportive of the scope is being made for biodiversity and well-being within the plans. Links to the local heritage specific to North Tyneside, such as in the presence of many former colliery waggonways and railway | | Green Infrastructure | Comments and support noted. | "Many components of the green infrastructure network provide a setting to heritage assets or are heritage assets in their |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | | routes being used in the likes of footpaths and cycle trails as green corridors also possess a historic component and that should be emphasized, not only for their investigation, but also in their presentation to members of the public wherever possible (such as in your AS1.5c, 5.13, DM9.2b and 9.2d, S10.3.3a). | | | | own right, such as the area's waggonways." added to para 8.2 (now para 8.3). |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015658 | As you will be aware, the North Tyneside Council area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. Within North Tyneside there are approximately 622 recorded mine entries and around 161 coal mining related hazards have been reported to The Coal Authority in the area. In addition to these legacy features the plan area contains recorded shallow coal workings, probable shallow coal workings, thick coal outcrops, past surface coal mining all of which constitute potential risk to future development. There are also 9 mine gas sites within the Council area and we have granted 128 permit applications in the area for parties to disturb, intersect or investigate our coal assets. Approximately 29% of North Tyneside is within the "Development High Risk" area, i.e. the area in which mining legacy risk features are present. Mining legacy features are concentrated across the northern and eastern three quarters of the area, although individual features do also exist in the south-west quadrant. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where | | Minerals | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. As The Coal Authority owns the coal and coal mine entries on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of The Coal Authority may be required.</p> | | | | |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015664 | <p>Paragraphs 8.50, 8.51 and 8.52 Support “ The Coal Authority supports acknowledgement in these paragraphs that North Tyneside has a strong history of mineral extraction and that the area is located in an area of shallow coal.</p> | | Minerals | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 466900 | Mineral Products Association | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152145 | <p>The Mineral Products Association (MPA) is the trade association for the aggregates, asphalt, cement, concrete, dimension stone, lime, mortar and silica sand industries. With the recent addition of The British Precast</p> | | Minerals | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | | Concrete Federation (BPCF) and the British Association of Reinforcement (BAR), it has a growing membership of 450 companies and is the sectoral voice for mineral products. MPA membership is made up of the vast majority of independent SME companies throughout the UK, as well as the 9 major international and global companies. It covers 100% of GB cement production, 90% of aggregates production and 95% of asphalt and ready-mixed concrete production and 70% of precast concrete production. Each year the industry supplies £9 billion of materials and services to the £120 billion construction and other sectors. Industry production represents the largest materials flow in the UK economy and is also one of the largest manufacturing sectors. | | | | |
| 466900 | Mineral Products Association | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152146 | Given the NPPF's recognition of the economic and employment benefits of the extractive industries (paras 28 & 144) we should like to direct your attention to "Making the Link", a document produced by the MPA to highlight the contribution that the sector makes to the economy. The document can be downloaded from the following website. http://www.mineralproducts.org/documents/MPA_MTL_Document.pdf | | Minerals | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 466900 | Mineral Products Association | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152147 | In para 8.55 we think that the supporting text is unsound when it refers to "...nor does a MSA mean that non-mineral development would not receive support." We believe this statement is incompatible with NPPF para 144 which says that lpas should "not normally permit other development proposals in mineral safeguarding areas where they might | | Minerals | Comments noted. | "nor does a MSA mean that non-mineral development would not receive support. " removed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | constrain potential future use for these purposes;" In view of this national policy requirement we believe that the final part of the last sentence of this paragraph should be deleted from the Local Plan as being unsound. | | | | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015490 | <p>Whilst there are positive aspects to the Local Plan, Northumberland Wildlife Trust has considerable concerns, primarily relating to policy content, landscape connectivity and the large allocations of green land for development. We consider that such issues must be addressed to ensure that the future growth of North Tyneside is fully sustainable for both people and wildlife. NWT feels that the plan is based on growth rates which are overly-ambitious and ignore earlier consultation feedback showing a public opinion for a lower rate of growth to save valued green spaces. In addition, evidence provided by North Tyneside Council to the examination in public for Newcastle City Local Plan, stated a lower anticipated growth rate than have been used in preparation of this plan. It is inconceivable that such a dramatic change would be probable. Given this, NWT believe that there is no evidence-based justification for the safeguarding of additional land for development beyond the Plan period, therefore safeguarded sites should be removed. Whilst a number of alterations have been made since the last consultation, many of them welcomed, NWT still considers that much of the plan does not to meet the requirements of National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs*: i, 81 - positively to enhance the beneficial use of the</p> | | The Natural Environment 8 | Comments noted. The growth rate identified within the 2015 of the Local Plan is based on the most up-to-date population projections. Safe-guarded land has been identified in order to meet longer-term development needs which go beyond the plan period. NWT's specific issues with the plan are dealt with individually. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Green Belt i. 109 - The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: o recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; o minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; i. 110 --In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise "i adverse effects on the local and natural environment. i. 114 - Local planning authorities should: o set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure; and o maintain the character of the undeveloped coast i. 117 - To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should: o identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation; i. 118 - proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments)</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>should not normally be permitted. The LPA should be planning positively for biodiversity, seeking net gain and producing a coherent and functioning wildlife corridor network. Many of the current allocations for development, such as sites 22-26, 35-41 and 109 do not meet this and will ultimately result in a net loss of biodiversity with fragmented small areas of habitat, not linked by a workable network of wildlife corridors. Furthermore, NWT consider that the LPA are not planning positively for biodiversity and not meeting the requirements of NNPF by failing to produce a strategic map of identified areas for biodiversity off-setting, mitigation, compensation and wildlife habitat creation. Indeed NWT has met with Council representatives and proposed this prior to the publication of this and this has not been included.</p> | | | | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015501 | <p>The Northumberland Wildlife Trust would have welcomed a more visionary approach to Natural Environment policies; ones that truly push towards ecological sustainability and not one that effectively looks to minimise the effects of development. In order to produce this, we feel that an ecological audit and subsequently improved strategy would be useful. This statement remains current, however we welcome some of the changes made in light of previous comments.</p> | | The Natural Environment 8 | <p>Comments noted. Specific comments and concerns the NWT has on the Local Plan are dealt with individually.</p> | No amendments proposed. |
| 804850 | | | LP2015758 | <p>The Blacksmiths Farm/Dickies Holm area of West Monkseaton could be converted, managed and maintained to provide a pleasant area for wildlife and residents. It is currently a haven for wildlife but lacks management.</p> | | The Natural Environment 8 | <p>This is part of the Murton Gap strategic site. As part of the development of a concept plan for the area and forthcoming masterplanning work, the constraints of the site have/will be assessed and managed</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | accordingly. This includes ensuring provision for biodiversity. | |
| 805543 | | | LP20151087 | Hypocrisy. The council are determined to cover North Tyneside with bricks at any cost. | | The Natural Environment 8 | Comments noted. North Tyneside Local Planning Authority must find a balance between social, economic and environmental needs. North Tyneside recognises the importance of the natural environment and sets out a number of policies in order to manage, protect and enhance it. For instance Policy S5.1 outlines that 'The council will seek the protection, enhancement, extension and creation of green infrastructure in appropriate locations within, and adjoining the Borough. Where deficiencies in the quality of green infrastructure and in particular types of green infrastructure are identified in relevant up-to-date evidence, improvements will be targeted to those areas accordingly. | No amendments proposed |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015502 | Whilst the Northumberland Wildlife Trust is in support of this policy, we note that the Local Authority will need to fund the "relevant up-to-date evidence" base, as at present this information is not available. This statement remains current. Paragraph 8.2 and 8.4. Whilst we welcome the acknowledgment of the benefits of Green Infrastructure, it should be noted that the area within Green Infrastructure needs to be large enough to perform all these functions listed. We question the allocations in the Local Plan at present and how these will provide sufficient area for green infrastructure and to provide all the functions the document requires it to. This statement remains current. This policy | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comment noted. The 'appropriate locations' will differ on a site by site basis and will be determined through the planning application process. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | states that "the Council will seek the protection, enhancement, extension and creation of green infrastructure in appropriate locations€ . NWT would seek clarification on where the "appropriate locations€ are? We suggest that the LPA should produce a detailed strategic plan for areas of GI, as well as mitigation and compensation sites for various developments. This would enable a targeted approach to GI protection, linkages, enhancement, extension and creation, as well as biodiversity conservation, enhancement and creation thus allowing the LPA to meet Paragraph 114 to plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity. | | | | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015545 | Furthermore, we do not consider the wildlife corridor allocations to be either functional or accurate to what is on the ground. These appear to be very loose links between small areas of green land (a lot of which is either currently allocated for development or is allocated in this new Local Plan) that do not form any coherent tangible wildlife link across the borough. For these wildlife corridors to have any functionality or be defensible in a planning inquiry they should be realistic and enforceable. Therefore at present the wildlife corridors do not meet NPPF requirement (paragraph 109) to establish "coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures€ . | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. North Tyneside's Wildlife Corridors have been mapped in line with National Planning Policy requirements. North Tyneside Council is working closely with both the NWT and Natural History Society of Northumbria to further define the currently indicative Wildlife Corridors. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |
| 898208 | | RESIDENT | LP2015729 | The protection of wildlife, through the preservation of wildlife corridors, valued green spaces and sites of special local wildlife | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | interest, bring benefits to people's health, wellbeing and enjoyment, for generations to come. | | | | |
| 898230 | | RESIDENT | LP2015736 | The protection of wildlife, through the preservation of wildlife corridors, valued green spaces and sites of special local wildlife interest, bring benefits to people's health, wellbeing and enjoyment, for generations to come. | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |
| 898375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015766 | I visit a number of reserves in North Tyneside including Swallow Pond and St Mary's so know what important wildlife corridors they provide as well as attractive amenity to their areas. | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |
| 898613 | | | LP2015857 | I think that much of what is quoted in DM8.1 and DM8.2 has been sadly ignored and neglected when planning permission were given regarding developments surrounding The Rising Sun Country Park. There are obviously no guarantees that the present park area will not be squeezed and squeezed until it is no longer a real natural sanctuary but instead a part of the green corridors overrun by housing and industry and that even if it survives to become a green corridor ! It is obvious from the consultation document development map that this will happen, land behind Asda Supermarket and around Scaffold Hill Quarry Pond will go as will land west of Hadrian Park. It's a shocking deceit and unfortunately the majority of folk are not truly aware of what is going on. And further more greater publicity should be given as to who is identifying the areas and deficiencies specified as greater public consultation on these matters needs to be addressed. | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. As the Local Plan is yet to be adopted Policies S8.1 (now S5.1) and DM8.2 (now DM5.2) could not be implemented and policies in the current Unitary Development Plan (UDP) were used. The Council refused the Station Road application, however due to an in-sufficient housing land supply and an out of date Plan the planning application was approved by an independent inspector through the appeal process. The Local Plan must balance economic, environmental and social needs of the Borough. The Rising Sun Country Park is designated as a Site of Local Conservation Interest and is highlighted as a key asset in the Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). The Green Infrastructure Strategy also highlights The Rising Sun Country Park as an area for anticipated extension and improvements following associated residential development. Consultation on North Tyneside's Local Plan has been carried | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | out in line with National Guidance. Information was posted to all residents within North Tyneside, press notices were released, online information was provided and public events were held in various locations throughout the Borough. The recently updated Green Space Strategy details green space and deficiencies within the Borough. North Tyneside have both online and paper versions of this document to view. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | |
| 805689 | | | LP2015893 | I believe that every piece of greenery is an important part of our green infrastructure - including the verges alongside our road network. It is hugely depressing and detrimental to a person's well being to see the enormous amount of litter every inch of the way on one's journey whether it be by foot, car, bus or metro. No wonder people have such a negative impression of North Tyneside Council when the current litter epidemic appears to be completely ignored. Ok, there was an article in the Guardian and your latest newsletter about the Big Spring Clean - but in reality this is far too small an effort. The Council needs to be seen to lead a widespread campaign to clear up the region and educate/encourage people to keep it that way. Help people get back a sense of responsibility and pride and maybe you'll find they are more open to looking at your wider plans more positively. | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. The Planning system primarily deals with the built environment. The Council have a Streetcare team who deal with litter issues and they are aware of your concerns. Residents are encouraged to report issues by calling the team or via an online form: http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/403/report-untidy-streets-and-overflowing-litter-bins Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |
| 898912 | | RESIDENT | LP2015974 | I have tried to make sense of the Wildlife corridors depicted on Map 1 of the 2015 Consultation , and they seem more | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. The Wildlife Corridors on the consultation map are indicative. The Local Plan (2015) is included a suite of | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | theoretical than real. In many cases they are much thinner than shown on the map, and consist of things like metro lines and fields-which hardly count as corridors. In some cases they pass through housing estates! They are already crossed by roads, which are an obvious hazard for wildlife. | | | additional evidence based documents which include the Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). The Green Infrastructure Strategy contains a more detail Wildlife Corridor Map. Metro Lines are very important Wildlife Corridors, lots of Wildlife can be found within the area including the protected Slow Worm. Wildlife Corridor designation does not automatically render development obsolete. Local Planning Authorities are required by National Planning Policy to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife. North Tyneside's Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Wildlife corridors help to identify the importance of the area within the network. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | |
| 899432 | | RESIDENT | LP20151250 | Site128: I would like to take this opportunity to say that I strongly support the designation of the Benton Curve as a wildlife corridor. This sort of thing is vitally important these days as more wildlife habitats disappear under Tarmac and concrete. | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151254 | S8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure Our Client supports the inclusion and protection of green infrastructure within the Consultation Document and in line with the NPPF (76). However, our Client has concerns that the extent of the buffer zone on Killingworth Wagonway is unjustified in the Consultation Document and unjustified in the evidence base: Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). Our Clients justification for this is set out below. A key objective of the GI Strategy is to | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | The area north of Simonside Way is designated as a site of Local Wildlife Interest. The waggonway is highlight established and provides important wildlife habitat. As stated in paragraph 117 of the NPPF local planning authority must identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>develop buffers around new and existing PROWs, and access routes to ensure that they support wildlife migration, as well as sustainable transport and recreation. This has been carried out with a positively prepared strategic approach to Green Infrastructure provision, in line with the NPPF (114). However, there is little evidence within the GI to demonstrate the specifics of how these PROWs and access routes support wildlife migration. The GI and Green Space Strategies refer that the majority of information used to determine North Tyneside's Wildlife Corridors, and high quality and high value open space is based on information from Natural England and existing records, however these are not demonstrated within the strategy documents, there is a lack in the evidence base to justify the significant buffers around some of the wildlife corridors (as illustrated at 7.2 GI Strategy, 2015). The GI Strategy does note that buffer zones vary in width depending on the type and size of habitat it contains, but there is little or no description of this for the various sites throughout the strategy or appended documents. Our Client requests that further clarification on the methodology and each buffer distance is required for wildlife corridors (GI Strategy, 2015). In regards to the Killingworth Wagonway, specifically the tree-lined area north of Simonside Way, Killingworth, which runs from the B1317 to the A1056, the east side of the PROW is unjustified as this is agricultural land which is actively farmed and managed, and there is no</p> | | | <p>stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. The Local Authority began by mapping North Tyneside's hierarchy of sites and drawing up obvious links between these ecological sites. There is no statutory methodology for applying buffer zones to the designated Wildlife Corridors. Buffers are provided to ensure protection of the various designated sites. The green infrastructure has been amended to include more detail on the work drawn upon. It must be noted that buffer zones are indicative and will be dealt with on a site by site basis. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>public access. The buffer distance is not quantified; our Client requests figures for buffer distances should be demonstrated, including the methodology for these quantifications. The western side of the buffer is justified due to its identification as an area of high value and quality, which includes areas of publically accessible high quality open space (Map 1, Green Space Strategy, 2015). Our Client would support the western buffer to protect the both the public Green Spaces (as identified in the Green Space Strategy, 2015), and provide environmental support for wildlife migration and aesthetic enhancement for social and economic contributions of the Wagonway. However, our Client would suggest a reduction in the eastern buffer due to: "ç lack of demonstrated need for wildlife migration and aesthetic value of such a significant eastern buffer on agricultural land; "ç smaller buffer on eastern side will not impact on the aesthetic value of the area and there will still be a buffer around the publically accessible green space area of high value and quality (western side of buffer); "ç open spaces will still be strategically connected and wildlife corridors will still be well integrated (as per the key objectives of the GI Strategy, 2015 and the NPPF, paragraph 76); and "ç as the GI Strategy (2015) advocates that a wildlife corridor should be formed adjacent to the A19, if the identified strategic site (Proposals Map, 22 - 26) is to come forward. Identified new residential sites should include protected green infrastructure (Recommendation 16)</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | (Objective 8). A wildlife corridor adjacent to the A19 will be required to be mature prior to any development being completed. This will serve as an additional wildlife corridor to support both wildlife migration and aesthetically enhance the area prior to development being complete (as well as provide screening for both noise and pollution). Our Client agrees that a buffer of the Killingworth Wagonway is required due to the protection of its wildlife, as well as the safeguarding of the aesthetic quality of the tree line between the existing and identified development; however this buffer should be proportionate to the level and value of wildlife within the area. One of the main objectives of the buffers is to prevent encroachment from development onto the PROW and prevent fragmentation and isolation the wildlife corridor. A western buffer can be justified through the Green Spaces Strategy (2015), nonetheless a reduced buffer should be identified on the eastern side of Killingworth Wagonway (between the B1317 and the A1056), and as such a significant buffer is not necessary to prevent encroachment from development. | | | | |
| 898630 | | | LP20151273 | The proposal to build houses on the remaining green fields along Whitley Road (sites 17, 111, 139 and 110) does not support the aims of this policy. I support the use of the north east curve of the metro for wildlife but I think you should retain the trackbed for potential future expansion of the metro. I object to the proposal to build houses on these sites so that we can retain the green | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. All the policies outlined in the Local Plan (2015) must be read as a whole. For instance policy DM8.2 (now DM5.2) states that 'the loss of any part of the green infrastructure network will only be considered in the following exceptional circumstances...'. 'Where development proposals could adversely affect green infrastructure, permission will only be | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | infrastructure that remains. In addition, you have added sites 111 and 139 since the last , yet sites 16, 18, 83, the land opposite Station Road near Darsley Park, a site at Palmersville, and four in Killingworth now have planning permission or are already built. I think this area has had enough development. There is a green break between Killingworth and Forest Hall, so there should be one between Forest Hall/Benton and Wallsend. Please safeguard this land. | | | granted where (e) alternative provision, equivalent to or better than in terms of its quantity and quality, can be provided in equally accessible locations which maintains or creates new green infrastructure connections; or (f) the proposed development would be ancillary to use of the green infrastructure and the benefits to green infrastructure would outweigh any loss of open area. The Local Plan must strike a balance between the economic, social and environmental needs of the borough. . The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with an objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | |
| 899469 | | | LP20151296 | This Plan does not effectively "check the unrestricted spread of the built-up area of North Tyneside" and in particular does not keep the separation between North Shields and Monkseaton and Monkseaton and Shiremoor. In fact, the Green Belt is just a buffer zone between North Tyneside and Northumberland. It should include areas within the borough. The Green Belt does however contain agricultural land and farming | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | As outlined in policy AS7.4 (now S4.4) 'green infrastructure corridors must be safeguarded through Strategic Allocations. Major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identity, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside and biodiversity'. Please note this policy number has now changed to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | activity which is an essential "" but ignored "" part of the local economy. | | | S5.1 | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151354 | Policy S8:1. Strategic Green Infrastructure - CPRE broadly welcomes this policy. | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |
| 472456 | | RESIDENT | LP20151406 | A lot of the green land should be used for agriculture and food production and put into the ownership of the citizens of NT growing fruit and vegetables for ourselves. This will provide quality jobs and increase a sense of pride and community. There is no mention of horticulture, agriculture or market gardening in your plan. | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comment noted. Whilst the Local Plan does not deal with food production and markets specifically this matter is discussed in detail in North Tyneside's Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). This document is a evidence base document which helps to inform the local plan and decision making. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |
| 472456 | | RESIDENT | LP20151407 | In order to fulfil the vision of a sustainable borough much greater attention needs to be given to the preservation and enhancement of the natural environment. Having wide open green spaces will not only benefit the mental and physical health of the citizens, provide the green lungs the environment need, it will make the place attractive to visit and add value to the borough. The more concrete that goes in the less attractive the place will look. | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comment noted. In line with National Planning Policy, North Tyneside must balance the environmental, social and economic needs of the Borough. In line with this North Tyneside must identify and meet the housing and employments needs of its residents. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151502 | These comments are submitted having regard to the comment in the Local Plan Consultation 2013 and Sites Analysis 2015 Schedule that land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA ref 298) is subject to an application to designate the site as Local Green Space. Nexus object to the designation of land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA ref 298) as Local Green Space / Green Space / Open Space for a number of reasons including; 1 Planning Practice Guidance (007 ref ID : 37-007-20140306) states that | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1). Given that the majority of the site was until very recently used for railway sidings the brownfield context is acknowledged. This site has been assessed through the SHLAA (Site 298) and was included as a potential development site in the 2013 of the plan. However, following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. The designation of land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton as Local Green Space is not consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. As set out in the SHLAA, the site is 100 percent brownfield. A core planning principle is to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided it is not of high environmental value. Land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton is not of high environmental value. Its reuse should be encouraged and it should be allocated and developed in preference to Greenfield sites listed in policy S7.3. A parallel representation has been submitted to policy S7.3. 2 North Tyneside Council's Green Space Strategy February 2015 assesses the value of the site 'low' and the quality of the site 'low', Map 1. In the circumstances the site is acknowledged not to be of particular value. The rationale behind the application for Local Green Space designation has to be questioned acknowledging the guidance in Planning Practice Guidance (007 ref ID : 37-007-20140306) that the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines the aim of plan making, namely to identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified needs. The rationale behind the application for the Local Green Space designation particularly has to be questioned acknowledging the statement in paragraph 1 of the Benton Triangle</p> | | | <p>from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. As a result the site will not be selected as preferred residential allocation. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Community's website applications' page that, 'there is a risk that it will be used for housing' http://www.bentontriangle.com/#!applications/coxh. 3 North Tyneside Council's Green Space Strategy February 2015 includes Objective 9 : Design of Green Spaces. This sets out a number of criteria as to how Green Spaces should be designed. The site does not meet these for reasons including the site is not accessible by all, access being through a fence and down a steep bank, it suffering disuse, it being unlit, there being evidence of antisocial behaviour on the site and that there are not any linkages through. The poor quality of the site is acknowledged in the Local Plan Consultation Sites Analysis report 2015 which under the heading Officer Response details that the site 'has remained largely inaccessible and unused'. 4 It is noted that in the application for the designation of the site as Local Green Space there is reference to allotments on the site. Whilst historically there might have been allotments on a portion of the site this has not been the case for some years, a matter acknowledged in the Council's Allotment Strategy 2009 " 2015 which records at the time the document was written they were not in use and this remains the case now. The reference to allotment gardens on the Proposals Map and on the Sites Analysis 2015 should be deleted. 5 The site is in Nexus's ownership. The proposal to 'create open space' requires Nexus' agreement otherwise the area will remain largely inaccessible and unused as it currently is as acknowledged in the Officer Response in</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------------|--|------------------|
| | | | | the Local Plan Consultation 2013 and Sites Analysis 2015. This goes to the deliverability of the proposal, policies amongst things having to be deliverable if the Plan is to be sound, NPPF para 182. Nexus' position is that the creation of open space in isolation is not deliverable. That said as has been detailed previously, if the site was subject of a comprehensive development package including open space and a residential development of around 50 dwellings in accordance with the Potential Sites Background Paper, there would be an opportunity to provide an overall scheme which is deliverable, in the public interest and amongst other things would result in high value and high quality open space meeting the standards in Objective 9 of the Council's Green Space Strategy 2015 | | | | |
| 803900 | Northumberland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151534 | The Council welcomes the strong approach to Green Infrastructure and particularly paragraph 8.3, which recognises that Green infrastructure does not stop at local authority boundaries and that work is on-going with neighbouring authorities to align strategic green infrastructure networks, assets and links. However, it is considered that the section would benefit from reference within the supporting text, of the Northumberland Coalfield Local Nature Partnership, which straddles the boundaries between Northumberland, North Tyneside and Newcastle and aims to tackle the lack of connectivity between wildlife areas over a 41,000 hectare area. | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Paragraph 8.3 (now para 8.5) amended as follows: Green infrastructure does not stop at local authority boundaries and work is on-going with neighbouring authorities, including the Northumberland Coalfield Local Nature Partnership to align strategic green infrastructure networks, assets and links. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | Amendments made. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 899297 | | | LP20151698 | <p>The Natural Environment I would welcome a more visionary approach to Natural Environment policies; ones that truly push towards ecological sustainability and not one that effectively looks to minimise the effects of development. In order to produce this, I do not understand why a full ecological audit has not been undertaken in order to improve the strategy. Policy S/8.1. This policy is good but, as above, I would suggest that the Local Authority will need to fund the "relevant up-to-date evidence" base, as at present this information is not available. Alternatively, there may be merit in discussing this with developers, who will inevitably need to do this separately, which may be less effective. Paragraph 8.2 and 8.4. I welcome the acknowledgment of the benefits of Green Infrastructure, it should be noted that the area within Green Infrastructure needs to be large enough to perform all these functions listed. I would question the allocations in the Local Plan at present and how these will provide sufficient area for green infrastructure and to provide all the functions the document requires it to. This policy states that "the Council will seek the protection, enhancement, extension and creation of green infrastructure in appropriate locations" . Please clarify where the "appropriate locations" are? I would suggest that the LPA should produce a detailed strategic plan for areas of GI, as well as mitigation and compensation sites for various developments. This would enable a targeted approach to GI protection, linkages,</p> | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | <p>Following designation as open space through the Local Plan, any proposal for alternative use of the site, including for residential development, would be assessed on individual merit in light of relevant policies. In this context, in addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM7.5 (now DM4.5). Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement for new homes to 2032. As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | enhancement, extension and creation, as well as biodiversity conservation, enhancement and creation thus allowing the LPA to meet Paragraph 114 to plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity. | | | | |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151824 | We support policies S/8.1 and DM/8.2 that seek to protect and provide Green Infrastructure, however we continue to recommend that the text relating green infrastructure recognises the benefits Green Infrastructure can contribute to WFD objectives. In particular in managing urban run-off and improving water quality. We consider this is particularly necessary due to the Water Framework Directive (WFD). WFD is European legislation designed to protect and enhance the quality of our rivers, lakes, streams, groundwater, estuaries and coastal waters, with a particular focus on ecology. WFD sets out the need to protect and improve the water environment in its totality. It applies to all surface water bodies, including rivers, streams, lakes, estuaries and canals, coastal waters, and all groundwater bodies. The Directive has two main objectives: "It sets a target for all waterbodies to achieve "good status" by 2015. "No deterioration in current status. Historically, urban rivers have been used as a convenient route for disposing of society's waste, with effluent from industry and sewage damaging the environment for people and wildlife. Despite the great progress made in tackling the harmful effects of urban pollution, many of North Tyneside's watercourses still fail to | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. North Tyneside Council understand and recognise the strong links between biodiversity and the WFD. For instance paragraph 8.42 (now para 8.43) states 'The water environment is vital for its contribution to the North Tyneside's biodiversity and is important to the quality of life of residents and visitors'. The Local Plan includes a strong policy initiative which will help to continue to improve North Tyneside's watercourses and water quality. Further detailed information on green infrastructure, urban-runoff and water quality can be found within the North Tyneside Green Infrastructure Strategy. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | meet the water quality standards necessary to support a healthy environment. In North Tyneside, urban run-off has been identified as one of the main reasons some of the rivers fail to meet the quality standards set by the Water Framework Directive. This is of particular importance for the Sandy's Letch, the Seaton Burn and the Brierdene. Green Infrastructure is of particular importance in addressing these issues. | | | | |
| 591119 | | | LP20151891 | Allotments. Although not legally binding, most allotment strategies quote the 1969 Thorpe Report, which recommends a minimum provision equivalent to 15 per 1,000 households. - Using your figure of 15,200 new homes it is expected that you provide 228 new allotments - Using your latest permitted builds figure of 5603 it is expected that you provide 84 new allotments I am sure you are aware that Local councils are required to audit allotment provision as part of Planning Policy Guidance 17. In addition, when assessing demand the local authority must take into account any written representations on the need for allotments by any 6 residents on the electoral register or persons liable to pay council tax (section 23(2) of the Small Holdings and Allotments Act 1908). You may expect written requests from at least 6 West Moor residents soon. I sincerely hope my comments are included in your considerations. Confirmation that this has specifically happened would be appreciated. | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | The comments with regard to the Green Space Strategy are acknowledged and it is correct that this site has been assessed as 'low' in terms of both value and quality in the latest of the GSS. The proposals for a Local Green Space designation have arisen from the representations of Benton Triangle Community and, as a result, it is considered necessary to undertake an assessment of the appropriateness of such a designation through the Local Plan process. However, following further appraisal it has been concluded that this site does not meet the criteria for designation as formal Local Green Space. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of | | LP20151897 | The LPA should be planning positively for biodiversity, seeking net gain and producing a coherent and functioning wildlife corridor | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comment noted. Policies S8.4, DM8.5 and DM8.6 (now S5.4, DM5.5 and DM5.6) are consistent with the guidance set out in the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | Northumbria | | | <p>network. Many of the current allocations for development, such as sites 22-26, 35-41 and 109 do not meet this and will ultimately result in a net loss of biodiversity with fragmented small areas of habitat, not linked by a workable network of wildlife corridors. Furthermore, NHSN consider that the LPA are not planning positively for biodiversity and not meeting the requirements of NNPF by failing to produce a strategic map of identified areas for biodiversity off-setting, mitigation, compensation and wildlife habitat creation. Whilst we support this policy, we note that the Local Authority will need to fund the "relevant up-to-date evidence" base, as at present this information is not available. Paragraph 8.2 and 8.4. Whilst we welcome the acknowledgment of the benefits of Green Infrastructure, it should be noted that the area within Green Infrastructure needs to be large enough to perform all these functions listed. We question the allocations in the Local Plan at present and how these will provide sufficient area for green infrastructure and to provide all the functions the document requires it to. This policy states that "the Council will seek the protection, enhancement, extension and creation of green infrastructure in appropriate locations" . However there is no indication in the plan about where these "appropriate locations" are. We suggest that the LPA should produce a detailed strategic plan for areas of GI, as well as mitigation and compensation sites for various developments. This would enable a targeted approach to GI</p> | | | <p>NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although sites 22-26, 35-41 and 109 have wildlife corridors running through them there is no reason to consider why these sites could not accommodate future development whilst adhering to the policies and maintaining a linked workable network of wildlife corridors. The Council officers comment on site 109 were that 'Development would not be supported if adequate and good quality wildlife corridors were not incorporated into any scheme'. The Council are keen to work with NWT to consider areas for biodiversity off-setting, mitigation, compensation and wildlife habitat creation and will look forward to further dialogue. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | protection, linkages, enhancement, extension and creation, as well as biodiversity conservation, enhancement and creation thus allowing the LPA to meet NPPF Paragraph 114 to plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity. | | | | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151945 | Natural England supports this policy (see advice on AS7.4). | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comments with regard to the current physical quality of the site are acknowledged, as is the limited accessibility. As referenced, the Local Plan Policies Map outlines that this land is 'allotment gardens'; however, this label is on the Ordnance Survey 1:10000 scale 'base map', a record which is maintained and update by that independent organisation. It is recognised that the site is not used as allotments and has not been for a number of years. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151970 | Green Infrastructure Strategy 2015 Natural England support the provision of a Green Infrastructure Strategy. The detail and recommendations included within can be used to encourage incorporation of GI into new developments, easing visitor pressure on the Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar, Northumberland Shore and Tynemouth to Seaton Sluice SSSIs. Green Space Strategy 2015 Natural England support the provision of a Green Space Strategy. Green space can contribute towards a GI network. | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.1 | No amendments proposed. |
| 396238 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20152092 | Sport's users and local people fully support the proposed development for Seaton Burn Welfare and ward Councillors have been asked by them to ensure the Council does | | S 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure | It is not considered that designation as open space would compromise the deliverability of Local Plan strategy. Not all designated open space is publically accessible and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | everything possible to secure the renewal of the Planning Application and hasten progress on starting work on this much needed facility. | | | therefore, even though this site is in private ownership, this decision is felt to be appropriate. | |
| 805724 | | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015276 | Note and support the statement at reasoned justification para 8.37 that sea defences around St Mary's car park are not designated a CCMA and will be maintained. | | AS 8.10 Coastal Erosion | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805689 | | | LP2015895 | "There is scope for improvements to walking and cycling facilities that will enable people to explore more of the coastline and a wider range of attractions."And number one priority should be clean them up and put in place the measures, facilities and education to keep them litter-free. I am reaching a point now where going for a walk is often a source of stress vs. enjoyment (although I do wish to point out that Whitley Bay beach itself is largely litter-free and I really appreciate that, so thanks to all involved in that effort). | | AS 8.10 Coastal Erosion | Comments noted. The Planning system primarily deals with the built environment. The Local Plan contains a policy to ensure that new developments provide sustainable waste management (during construction and use) through the provision of recycling facilities and ensure a suitable location for the storage and collection of waste (policy DM7.9 New Development and Waste). However the Local Plan or Planning system are otherwise not able to manage litter. The Council have a Streetcare team who deal with litter issues and they are aware of your concerns. Residents are encouraged to report issues by calling the team or via an online form: http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/403/report-untidy-streets-and-overflowing-litter-bins | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151363 | Policy AS8:10. CPRE supports this policy. | | AS 8.10 Coastal Erosion | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151501 | The Key on the Proposals Map references policy AS8.10 (Coastal Erosion), a policy reference which needs to be updated. | | AS 8.10 Coastal Erosion | Comments noted. Map amendments made. | Map amendments actioned |
| 803900 | Northumberland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151535 | The Council welcomes the policy on coastal erosion and would welcome further discussion as part of the Duty to Cooperate requirement in relation to the Coastal Change | | AS 8.10 Coastal Erosion | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-----------------------------|------------------|---|
| | | | | Management Areas. | | | | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151954 | Natural England supports this policy. | | AS 8.10 Coastal Erosion | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 805724 | | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015277 | Support expressed generally for the policy and its reasoned justification. | | AS 8.11 Coastal Green Links | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396449 | Cyclists Touring Club | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015585 | Paragraph 8.41. This would read better as: Much of NCN 1 from Tynemouth northwards, adjacent to the coastline, is designated as a shared footway/cycleway which allows all cyclists to use the footway (pavement). Previous consultations have raised the problem of pedestrians and cyclists sharing the footway and improved signage has been provided to make all users aware of other users and this has benefitted everyone. The cycle route through Cullercoats still needs to be improved to create extra space for cyclists and pedestrians in order to encourage more people to get active. | | AS 8.11 Coastal Green Links | Comments noted. | Para 8.41 (now para 11.95) amended to "Much of NCN 1 from Tynemouth northwards, adjacent to the coastline, is designated as a shared footway/cycleway that allows all cyclists to use the footway (pavement). Previous consultations have raised the problem of pedestrians and cyclists sharing the footway and improved signage has been provided to make all users aware of other users. The cycle route through Cullercoats still needs to be improved to create extra space for cyclists and pedestrians in order to encourage more people to get active." |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151364 | Policy AS8:11. CPRE welcomes this policy. | | AS 8.11 Coastal Green Links | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151955 | Natural England supports the requirement of this policy to be compliant with policy DM8.6 | | AS 8.11 Coastal Green | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | in order to ensure that there are no adverse effects on internationally designated sites. | | Links | | |
| 892642 | | RESIDENT | LP2015268 | Flooding around East Holywell! Also Wellfield | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893913 | | | LP2015371 | I have the following concerns: Flooding. My home has already flooded once I can't see how building more houses will help the already poor flood defences. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015540 | The Northumberland Wildlife Trust welcomes this policy, however would seek that there is a preference towards minimising flood risk using sustainable urban drainage and other means that would have the dual purpose of providing wildlife habitat whilst mitigating the flood risk. This statement remains current. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comments noted. Local Plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. To this end, they should be consistent with the principles and policies set out in the NPPF. SuDs is also advocated in separate policy regarding water management. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151010 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. | | DM 8.12 Development | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | and Flood Risk | requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151026 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151135 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151151 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. | | DM 8.12 Development | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | and Flood Risk | requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151168 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151182 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151224 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. | | DM 8.12 Development | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | and Flood Risk | requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | |
| 898630 | | | LP20151274 | Flooding has already been a problem for the Hadrian Lodge Estate. On that basis, and on the basis of survey's conducted on the land, the site identified as 111 should not be used for housing (as well as it is one of the last remaining green fields in the centre of the borough). | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151365 | Policy DM8:12 Development and flood risk. CPRE supports this policy. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151419 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | field prior to development. | |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151473 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151494 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151561 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151565 | My garden has significantly been affected by flooding over the last five years. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151663 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151681 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. For all major developments National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151705 | There should be a preference towards minimising flood risk using sustainable urban drainage and other means that would have the dual purpose of providing wildlife habitat whilst mitigating the flood risk. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted | No amendments proposed |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151803 | <p>Commentary surrounding flood risk in the supporting paragraphs of Policy DM8.12 is well received "" particularly the recognition of planning's central role within the facilitation of sustainable and safe development. We are equally supportive of the prominence of climate change within this text, as adaptation and mitigation should form key elements of a planning document spanning decades "" during which the impacts of climate change will be increasingly realised. We note that this section makes reference to flooding from all sources, which is strongly welcomed; however we would consider it beneficial if sources of flooding were individually identified within supporting text. An example list of flooding sources that should be considered within the LPCD is provided below: i. Rivers and watercourses (fluvial) ii. Sea (tidal) iii. Surface water runoff iv. Sewers v. Groundwater</p> <p>Furthermore, it is important to note the distinct characteristics of different flood sources, as not all flooding is as predictable as fluvial, in either location or frequency and therefore flood management policies must utilise a range of measures to reduce flood risk in the Borough. Flooding from sewers is increasingly recognised as an issue in areas that are not necessarily at risk from fluvial</p> | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | <p>Comments noted. The different sources of flooding are well documented within the evidence base.</p> <p>We do not wish to include cross references, however, appreciate that two water sections are confusing the document.</p> | The two water sections have been brought together into a Water Environment section of Chapter 8. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------------|------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>flooding. Storm events, which sometimes occur away from the areas concerned, cause major surface water runoff to enter the sewerage system. Where the network does not have capacity to accommodate peak flows, this causes the discharge of wastewater from the network to surrounding land and property. With regard to Policy DM8.12 specifically, we consider that the principles contained are sound and will serve to effectively manage the impact of new development upon flood risk. Having said this, we believe that the policy would benefit from a more comprehensive approach to sustainable water management in order to demonstrate clear links between flood risk reduction and other aspects of water management. It is our opinion that the implications of unsustainable surface water management should be clear within this section, and that cross-reference should be made to the content presently contained within Policies S10.9 and DM10.10.</p> | | | | |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151826 | <p>We support the inclusion of a flood risk and sustainable drainage policies. We welcome that Policy DM/8.12 has been further strengthened through adding a requirement to avoid development within areas at risk of flooding. In addition we support that the policy now seeks development should manage flood risk from all sources, taking into account the impact of climate change over its lifetime. Strand c) of the policy seeks to ensure that "there is no net increase in surface water run off" . We maintain that this policy should be amended to reflect issues</p> | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. | Water sections have been combined and rewritten, EA have been reconsulted on these changes. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>outlined in North Tyneside's Water Cycle Study (WCS) and Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP). As outlined in 10.57 and the WCS there currently is insufficient capacity at Howdon Sewerage Treatment Works (HSTW) to accommodate the increased foul drainage from the planned housing and employment growth. NWL are currently working on a Sustainable Sewerage Strategy across Tyne and Wear which will help remove surface water from sewers. Although this will help increase capacity at HSTW this will not free up sufficient capacity to accommodate all planned growth. Surface water is seen as both the problem and a solution to freeing up capacity at HSTW and enabling sustainable growth. The key to increasing capacity would be to take surface water out of the sewerage network - on this basis, we recommend that the policy reflects these requirements. In removing surface water from the sewer network careful consideration must be given to ensure that surface water does not increase flood risk elsewhere. On this basis, the requirement of "no net increase" may not be sufficiently reflect these issues. DM 10.10 seeks to limit post development run off rates to a maximum of 50% of the flows. We consider cross referencing of these policies is required to avoid confusion. You will know that the Government has announced that it intends to change our statutory consulted duties for planning applications. This also means making Lead Local Flood Authorities statutory consultees for surface water drainage issues for "major' developments.</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>This will need a change to the Development Management Procedure Order (DMPO). A new DMPO which includes these changes and consolidates the original DMPO and amendments made to it was recently published and will come into force on 15th April 2015. To support the new consultation arrangements, DCLG has changed the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The main changes are to the pages: Why are sustainable drainage systems important? How the local planning authority should involve the lead local flood authority when determining planning applications and what advice should be given about local flood risks Water supply , wastewater and water quality considerations in plan-making This guidance provides clarity on when SUDs are appropriate, together with minimum standards of operation and the need that there are clear arrangements in place for ongoing maintenance. On this basis, we consider it is essential that the Policy outlines the LPA's position and expectations "" particularly regarding maintenance and adoption of SUDS. The PPG further highlights that SUDS provide opportunities to: "ç reduce the causes and impacts of flooding; "ç remove pollutants from urban run-off at source; "ç combine water management with green space with benefits for amenity, recreation and wildlife. Given this emphasis of the wider benefits of flood risk, we consider that this policy can be strengthened to highlight the water quality, amenity, recreation and wildlife benefits. As previously highlighted a number</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>of recent planning applications have proposed direct deep drainage discharges of surface water to the bedrock. These have been particularly problematic at Algernon "" we welcome that the policy recognises deep drainage structures are unsuitable in this area. Mine water levels are currently actively managed across the Local Authority area. On this basis, we consider that such techniques do not provide a sustainable, long term solution due to rising groundwater levels reducing the storage capacity which may lead to groundwater flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>Discharges that concentrate the flow of effluent at one location and bypass some of the soil layers will limit the ability of the ground to attenuate pollutants and protect groundwater. Direct input into groundwater presents a significantly increased risk of pollution. We are seeking to stop cases where discharges are directly into the groundwater through wells, boreholes and shafts. The level of prior examination required to support a proposal to use a borehole may be significantly greater than required for near surface infiltration systems. An environmental permit may be required. On this basis, we would recommend that the asterisk highlights that deep drainage structures are unlikely to be suitable anywhere in the Authority area.</p> | | | | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152047 | <p>Policy DM8.12 sets the authorities approach to reducing flood risk, which is generally supported subject to the following concerns. The policy states that "all developments" will be required to demonstrate no flood risk over the lifetime of the proposed development.</p> | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. | Policy (now DM 5.12) has been amended to read "all major development". |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | We question how this would be applied in practice as only those developments over a size threshold or within specific flood risk zones should be required to provide a Flood Risk Assessment. Given this how does the Council envisage this policy being adhered to. | | | | |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152368 | My property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901563 | | RESIDENT | LP20152376 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901564 | | RESIDENT | LP20152392 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152393 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901558 | | RESIDENT | LP20152409 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901560 | | RESIDENT | LP20152410 | My or a neighbour's property has been affected by flooding within the last 5 years. Taking away further unpopulated land and adding additional homes concerns me that this may have a negative impact on potential future flooding within the local area. | | DM 8.12 Development and Flood Risk | Comment noted. National and Local Policy requires all development to demonstrate that the risk of flooding does not increase as a result of potential new development and should also contribute to reducing flood risk. Surface Water flooding is specifically considered in the plan and for green field sites the policy outlines that surface water run off post development must meet or exceed the infiltration capacity of the green field prior to development. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| 897641 | | RESIDENT | LP2015648 | <p>Firstly I know you rejected the West view build, however that area of land was always subject to flooding, and now following the building work, there is a significant issue arising all paths that run parallel to the wagon way, and the wagon way itself. You have carried out remedial work due to flooding near one housing area, however the when it rains, (and not so much), the paths are flooding, and water remaining for long periods of time. The fields are also showing signs of water retention, with the result that at the end of last year, a family of swans, and several seagulls took up residency. This also has had the result that the all the paths surfaces are deteriorating, which further exacerbates the flooding issue. This whole area is built on old mine workings, and I truly wonder if this has been at anytime taken into consideration when providing planning permission. Further building within this area is going to have a detrimental effect on the water plain, and the unknown factor is the mining works. There have been a number of "holes" appearing, and many happened where there were no known workings. All of this bodes ill for large areas of this council, where mining was the mainstay of employment.</p> | | DM 8.13 Flood Reduction Works | Comment noted. The impact of former mine working and groundwater has been considered throughout the preparation of the Local Plan. This work has involved engaging with stakeholders such as the Environment Agency and the Coal Authority. | No amendments proposed |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151366 | <p>Policy DM18:13 Flood reduction. CPRE supports this policy. Typo: In the last line, "complimentary" should read "complementary" .</p> | | DM 8.13 Flood Reduction Works | Comment noted. Wrong word used, this will be amended. | Policy DM8.13 ("complimentary" changed to "complementary" . |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151804 | <p>We welcome the collaborative approach to flood risk reduction and drainage highlighted in DM8.13 and we will be happy to continue</p> | | DM 8.13 Flood Reduction | Comment noted | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|--------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|---|
| | | | | our existing role working in partnership with North Tyneside Council and other parties to achieve reductions in flood risk. Furthermore, we support the requirement for developments which are deemed to potentially impact upon drainage capacity (including reference to cumulative impact) to make offsetting contributions. Equally important is the requirement for developments to ensure works are complementary to wider plans, as a comprehensive approach to flood risk and sustainable drainage is a critical component in the viability of development sites such as those proposed at Murton. | | Works | | |
| 803900 | Northumb erland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151536 | Land won primary aggregates Policy DM8.14 criterion b - Opportunities for the extraction of primary minerals for aggregate uses in North Tyneside seem limited on the basis of the resource present. Nonetheless it is recognised that the criterion is positively phrased and will be used to assess any proposals that may come forward over the plan period. The Council supports this approach. | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 803900 | Northumb erland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151536 | Restoration Policy DM8.14 criterion c - The principle of this policy criterion is supported and it is recognised that this addresses the requirements set out in Paragraph 143 of the NPPF. Criterion c could, however, be usefully amended by adding additional text to recognise that there are opportunities that can be delivered through mineral site restoration. For example, mineral site restoration can deliver net-gains for biodiversity, improvements for agriculture | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted and policy will be amended in accordance with suggestion. | "this could include the delivery of net-gains for biodiversity, improvements for agriculture and enhanced access for recreation. " added to the end of criterion c. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|--------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|---|
| | | | | and enhanced access for recreation. | | | | |
| 803900 | Northumb erland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151536 | Recycled and secondary aggregates Policy DM8.14 criterion d - This criterion is supported in principle but it would usefully benefit from clarification of what would constitute "'appropriate locations' for permanent recycling plants for construction and demolition waste. This could be addressed by cross referencing the policy for waste management (Policy S10.11) where some locational principles are set out. | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted and policy will be amended in accordance with suggestion. | "as defined in policy S10.11." added to the end of criterion d. |
| 803900 | Northumb erland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151536 | Supply of marine aggregates and Howdon Wharf Policy DM8.14 criterion e - In the County Council's response to the 2013 Consultation Local Plan we made comments regarding the need to recognise the strategic importance of Howdon Wharf in terms of its role in supplying sand and gravel for aggregate uses both locally to North Tyneside and to surrounding areas. The supply of sand and gravel from this wharf is considered to be particularly important given that there are no active quarries supplying minerals for aggregate use within North Tyneside. The important contribution of Howdon Wharf to the steady and adequate supply of sand and gravel for aggregate use is recognised in the Joint Local Aggregates Assessment for County Durham, Northumberland and Tyne and Wear. It is noted that amendments have been made to both the policy and the supporting text in response to the Council's comments and it is considered these amendments address the previous concerns. Criterion e is therefore supported. However, it would | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted. Howdon Wharf will be added to the Policies Map. | Howdon Wharf added to Map. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | | | appear that Howdon Wharf is not identified on the Policies Map and consideration should be given to its identification on the Policies Map. | | | | |
| 803900 | Northumb erland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151536 | Safeguarding mineral resources Policy DM8.14 criterion f - The amendments to the policy criteria and supporting text to differentiate between the mineral resources to be safeguarded and the related Mineral Safeguarding Areas are welcomed and supported. The shallow coal resource identified for safeguarding extends into the adjoining area of Northumberland. The Council considers that the approach in Policy DM8.14 is consistent with the emerging approach to mineral safeguarding in the Northumberland Local Plan. In order to improve the clarity of criterion f and its consistency with the NPPF, the following minor wording amendments are suggested: Mineral Safeguarding Areas are defined for shallow coal and basal sand and gravel resources in the plan area and their extent is shown on the Policies Map. These resources will be safeguarded from non-mineral development that would needlessly sterilise the resource and prejudice future mineral extraction. | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted and policy will be amended in accordance with suggestion. | Criterion f now reads "Mineral resources will be safeguarded from other forms of development that would prejudice future mineral extraction. Mineral Safeguarding Areas have been defined for shallow coal, marine and estuarine sand and gravel, basal sand, lower magnesian limestone, and glacial sand and gravel resources in the plan area and their extent is shown on the Policies Map. These resources will be safeguarded from non-mineral development that would needlessly sterilise the resource and prejudice future mineral extraction. Planning permission will not be granted for any form of development within a Mineral Safeguarding Area that is incompatible with safeguarding the mineral unless:" |
| 396412 | Northumb erland Wildlife | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATI | LP2015541 | The Northumberland Wildlife Trust is in support of point ; that any mineral extraction would only be permitted where there is no | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| | Trust | ON | | adverse environmental impact. This statement remains current. | | | | |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015665 | Positively Prepared - yes Justified - yes Effective - unclear Consistency to NPPF - unclear Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - yes The Coal Authority notes that this policy addresses all potential mineral proposals that may come forward, including energy and non-energy minerals development. It therefore needs to cover potential proposals which may come forward for hydrocarbons and unconventional hydrocarbons, including any new coal technology such as Coal Bed Methane or Underground Coal Gasification. Although it is accepted that there are currently no PEDL licences issued in North Tyneside by DECC, should this position change in the future there would be an obligation for those to be illustrated in the Local Plan. As currently the policy is not strictly in accordance with the 3 stage policy for hydrocarbons identified in the NPPG, which identifies that criteria based policies should cover the three phases of exploration, appraisal and production phases. Although the Coal Authority accepts that the Council may not wish to amend the policy to take account of something which has not yet been proposed in the area in order to clarify that this policy relates to all potential minerals which may come forward during the plan period it is suggested that additional supporting text is included as follows:"8.59 Should any proposals come forward for conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons these will be considered in | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted. | "Should any proposals come forward for conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons these will be considered in accordance with the policies and guidance set out in the NPPF and NPPG and the above policy as relevant to the stage of exploration, appraisal or production." added in at 8.59, as suggested. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | accordance with the policies and guidance set out in the NPPF and NPPG and the above policy as relevant to the stage of exploration, appraisal or production." | | | | |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015666 | Positively Prepared - yes Justified - yes Effective - yes Consistency to NPPF - yes Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - yes Support - The policy places a strong emphasis in criterion b. to achieve high standards of restoration and aftercare which The Coal Authority strongly supports. This will ensure that sites can be put to appropriate beneficial afteruse without future public safety issues arising from legacy. | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015667 | Positively Prepared - no Justified - no Effective - no Consistency to NPPF - no Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate Objection: The Coal Authority notes that the 1 hectare threshold for mineral safeguarding has been removed from the policy, we are disappointed to see that site allocations have now been excluded from the requirements to consider mineral safeguarding. Although it is accepted that the 2011 BGS/The Coal Authority Practice Guide to Mineral Safeguarding does include applications in accordance with the development plan in its exemptions criteria it clearly states that this is only acceptable where the allocations process takes account of the prevention of unnecessary sterilisation and determines that prior extraction should not be considered when development proposals come forward. The Coal Authority can find no evidence that the sites identified for development in the Local Plan have been | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted. The criterion "development already allocated in a statutory plan;" should not be included and will be removed. The policy now uses a criteria rather than a size threshold on the advice of the Mineral Products Association. | "development already allocated in a statutory plan;" removed from the criteria. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | | considered in respect of mineral safeguarding and potential for prior extraction and therefore object to the inclusion of this criterion. The Coal Authority fully accepts that there needs to be some appropriate way of implementing the minerals safeguarding policy. Where development thresholds can be justified then this is often a way forward and although the Coal Authority would object to an arbitrary threshold, in cases were LPAs can provide evidence and reasoning behind such threshold proposals these have been accepted. In neighbouring South Tyneside the Council evidenced their 1 hectare threshold in their plan by identifying that most site allocations exceeded the threshold. Meaning that the majority of planned development that will come forward would fall within the remit of consideration, but it provided a balance to implementation. The Coal Authority had asked North Tyneside to justify the previously proposed 1 hectare threshold, it was the lack of evidence justification that we objected to. The Coal Authority would be happy to discuss this issue further to try and find a suitable solution for the North Tyneside area before examination. | | | | |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015668 | Positively Prepared - yes Justified - no Effective -no Consistency to NPPF - no Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - yes Objection: The MSA is not illustrated on the Policies Map which is necessary for the policy to be justified and effective. It is necessary for policies that contain a spatial dimension to be illustrated on the Policies Map in order to provide the | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted. MSAs will be added to the Policies Map. | MSAs added to Policies Map. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | necessary clarity to plan users. It is accepted that in paragraph 8.53 of the plan it does clearly state that: "The whole of the plan area has been identified as a MSA" However it is considered necessary to also make this clear on the Policies Map. It may be that a simple notation on the key could be added referring to "Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) Policy DM/8.14" and indicating that it covers the whole of the plan area. This would avoid any potential confusion. The adopted Proposals Map accompanying the South Tyneside Site Allocations DPD utilised the latter approach of a note on the key to good effect. Reason: The lack of illustration of the MSA spatially on the Policies Map does not accord with paragraph 143 of the NPPF, or the advice in the 2011 BGS/The Coal Authority Practice Guide to Mineral Safeguarding in England which provides the practice advice on this topic. | | | | |
| 898977 | | | LP20151005 | The proposal for housing development within the land adjacent to Killingworth Moor would effectively prevent any future mineral development and is therefore enforcing mineral sterilisation by non-mineral development. | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted. In consultation with the Coal Authority, we have amended policy DM8.14 (now Policy DM5.14) to ensure that prior to development on land that has mineral value, the mineral should be extracted satisfactorily prior to the development taking place. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151367 | Policy DM8:14 Minerals. CPRE broadly supports this policy. In the Durham Plan, Mineral Safeguarding Areas are linked to countryside character assessments which we find a helpful approach. Elsewhere, we have also found useful policy requiring bonds from mineral extractors against the cost of remediation given a number of instances where bankruptcy etc has resulted in | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted. The MSAs have been prepared using the advice of the Coal Authority and evidence set out in the British Geological Survey's Mineral Resource Map. We feel that criterion c of the policy adequately ensures the appropriate level of aftercare. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|-----------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | | | remediation not meeting the promised standard. | | | | |
| 803900 | Northumb erland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151536 | Policy DM8.14 Minerals The recognition of the need to plan for minerals is welcomed and the policy principles for minerals are generally supported. It is considered that the policy provides appropriate strategic criteria for mineral extraction, site restoration, safeguarding minerals resources and minerals related infrastructure and encourages opportunities for recycled materials. | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899297 | | | LP20151706 | I would support the inclusion of "a"; that any mineral extraction would only be permitted where there is no adverse environmental impact. | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNME NT AGENCY | LP20151956 | Natural England supports this policy. | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNME NT AGENCY | LP20151967 | There is not a policy on soils and agricultural land quality in the local plan. Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services (ecosystem services) for society; for instance as a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, as a store for carbon and water, as a reservoir of biodiversity and as a buffer against pollution. It is therefore important that the soil resources are protected and used sustainably. The Natural Environment White Paper 'The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature' (Defra, June 2011), emphasises the importance of natural resource protection, including the conservation and sustainable management of soils, for example: i. A Vision for Nature: "We must protect the essentials of life: our air, biodiversity, soils and water, so that they can continue to provide us with the services | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted. Policy will be added as suggested. ALC surveys will be carried out for the strategic sites at Murton and Killingworth. | New section - "Soil and Agricultural Land Quality" has been included within Natural Environment chapter. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>on which we rely' (paragraph 2.5). i, Safeguarding our Soils: "Soil is essential for achieving a range of important ecosystem services and functions, including food production, carbon storage and climate regulation, water filtration, flood management and support for biodiversity and wildlife' (paragraph 2.60). i, "Protect "best and most versatile' agricultural land' (paragraph 2.35). The conservation and sustainable management of soils also is reflected in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly in paragraphs 109 and 112. When planning authorities are considering land use change, the permanency of the impact on soils is an important consideration. Particular care over planned changes to the most potentially productive soil is needed, for the ecosystem services it supports including its role in agriculture and food production. Plan policies should therefore take account of the impact on land and soil resources and the wide range of vital functions (ecosystem services) they provide in line with paragraph 17 of the NPPF, for example to: i, Safeguard the long term capability of "best and most versatile" agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification system*) as a resource for the future. i, To avoid development that would disturb or damage other soils of high environmental value (e.g. wetland and other specific soils contributing to ecological connectivity, carbon stores such as peatlands etc) and, where development is proposed. i, Ensure soil resources are</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>conserved and managed in a sustainable way. The council will therefore require prospective developers to ensure that sufficient site specific Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey data is available to inform decision making. For example, where no reliable information was available, we would expect that a new detailed ALC survey should be provided, together with proposals for mitigating any adverse impacts on soil resources or the irreversible loss of high quality land. * As specified in the MAFF / Defra publication Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales - revised guidelines and criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land (1988). Proposed New Policy: Soil and Agricultural Land Quality Development of "best and most versatile" agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification system*) will not normally be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that: The need for the development clearly outweighs the need to protect such land in the long term, or i. In the case of temporary / potentially reversible development (e.g. minerals), that the land would be reinstated to its pre-working quality, and i. There are no suitable alternative sites on previously developed (brownfield) or lower quality land. The council will require all applications for development to include realistic proposals to demonstrate that soil resources were protected and used sustainably, in line with accepted best practice.* (*For example; the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites August 2013) As regards any site specific proposals in the emerging local plan, our recommendation would be that developers (or the council) should commission a new ALC survey, for any sites being put forward for consideration. However, should certain sites be allocated in the absence of such information, we would expect these soil and agricultural land quality criteria to be satisfactorily addressed by any subsequent detailed planning application. | | | | |
| 466900 | Mineral Products Association | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152149 | We are pleased to see that a number of our previous suggestions for changes have been incorporated in this . However, there are a number of anomalies that still need to be addressed in order for the plan to be considered sound. | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 466900 | Mineral Products Association | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152150 | Item f. follows fairly closely our suggested changes in the last consultation. However, we note that the policy is not consistent with the supporting text, and one or other of them needs to be amended. In particular, the policy mentions only coal and basal sand and gravel MSAs whilst the supporting text (para 8.53) also includes limestone and marine and estuarine sand and gravel resources. | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted. The policy did not refer to all mineral resources; this will be amended. | Policy now refers to all mineral resources in the Borough: shallow coal, marine and estuarine sand and gravel, basal sand, lower magnesian limestone, and glacial sand and gravel resources. |
| 466900 | Mineral Products Association | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152154 | We also question the apparent approach of having one MSA for all non energy minerals regardless of their nature. The BGS good practice guidance implies that an MSA should be designated for each mineral based on its characteristics. We urge the lpa to separate out each mineral for its own MSA. | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted. This will be changed accordingly. | Policy and supporting text now refers to separate MSAs for each mineral resource. The policies map will also be changed. |
| 466900 | Mineral Products | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152156 | We could not find any reference to MSAs on the Policies Map and so have been unable to | | DM 8.14 Minerals | Comments noted. MSAs and Howdon Wharf will be added to the Policies Map. | MSAs and Howdon Wharf added to Policies Map. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|--|------------------|-------------------------|
| | Association | GANISATION | | check the information in the Plan referring to the boundaries of the MSAs. Nor could we find a reference to the safeguarding of Howden Wharf on the Policies Map. We therefore reserve our position in respect of these matters. If the lpa can make this information available to us we would gladly consider it. | | | | |
| 408348 | The Coal Authority | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP2015669 | Positively Prepared - yes Justified - yes Effective - yes Consistency to NPPF - yes Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - yes Support : Policy DM/8.15 addresses unstable land and complies with national planning policy set out in paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and 166 of the NPPF. The policy will support the effective implementation of the risk based approach to development management that The Coal Authority operates across the UK with regard to mining legacy and unstable land. The policy is effective in that it addresses the requirement for necessary information to be supplied to the LPA and for the impact of the stability issues on the development to be clearly indicated. It also goes onto complete this process by requiring appropriate remedial measures to be put forward to allow the development to go ahead. The policy is also clear that implementation of remedial measures will be secured by planning condition. Reason: The Local Plan is consistent with advice in the NPPF | | DM 8.15 Contaminated and Unstable Land | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151957 | Natural England supports this policy. | | DM 8.15 Contaminated and Unstable Land | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151019 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151035 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151143 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151158 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | been quantified? | | | highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151175 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151189 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151203 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151217 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151233 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151246 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151427 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | submission. | |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151445 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151466 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151480 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151510 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151525 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151574 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900011 | | RESIDENT | LP20151602 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | been quantified? | | | highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151627 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151671 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151690 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151958 | Natural England supports this policy. | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 901541 | | RESIDENT | LP20152351 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 901549 | | RESIDENT | LP20152362 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152382 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152405 | As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 901558 | | RESIDENT | LP20152415 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901560 | | RESIDENT | LP20152416 | Pollution- As the A191 East of Holystone Interchange is primarily residential. How has the impact of any future stopstart signalling been quantified? | | DM 8.16 Pollution | Comment noted. The announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network will require an Outline Business Case (OBC) to be prepared for those schemes that qualify for the funding. This will then be submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. | |
| 893716 | | RESIDENT | LP2015348 | Dear planning policy, Just a note to say how strongly I support the designation of the Benton curve (adjacent to the Oval in NE12) as a wildlife corridor. I am so pleased the local authority has recognised the environmental value of this land and I'm sure I speak on behalf of all the local residents who would hate to see it developed in any way. Thanks and best regards, | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2 | No amendments proposed. |
| 893914 | | RESIDENT | LP2015384 | I support the idea of retaining the old railway track known as the Benton South West curve as a green corridor. That corridor is shown on the plan circulated to residents as linking with the Rising Sun Country Park, so I am against the proposals to put houses on the fields numbered 139 and 17 on that plan. Just as there needs to be a green break between Killingworth and Forest Hall, so there needs to be one between Forest Hall and Wallsend. | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. As outlined in the NPPF, North Tyneside Council Local Plan must strike a balance between the economic, social and environmental needs of the Borough. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2 | No amendments proposed. |
| 893913 | | | LP2015416 | I have the following concerns: Loss of Green Area | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | North Tyneside recognises that a balance must be made between new developments and the protection and enhancement of green space/ green infrastructure. A | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | number of policies within the Natural Environment chapter have been included to ensure the protection, enhancement and extension of green infrastructure. This is particularly visible in policy S5.1, DM5.2 AND DM5.3. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2 | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015503 | We welcome the recognition that if development impinges on Green Infrastructure that alternative provision should maintain green infrastructure connections. This statement remains current. We consider that the meaning of sustainable is getting confused with appropriate levels of growth/development. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust brings the LPA's attention to The UK Sustainable Development Strategy Securing the Future that sets out five "guiding principles" of sustainable development: living within the planet's environmental limits; ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; achieving a sustainable economy; promoting good governance; and using sound science responsibly. Sustainability requires us to conserve and enhance our natural environment; significant parts of this document contradict this aim. Whilst this statement is no longer applicable to this policy, it is considered relevant to the wider document. NWT has concerns over the last sentence in this policy. The LPA are not "planning positively" (paragraph 114 of NPPF) for networks of biodiversity by requiring new green infrastructure to only "not cause adverse impacts". This policy should be looking to meet the aims of | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. As stated in the previous 2013 consultation process, there are many available definitions of Sustainable Development; the Council have based their understanding on National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). We have not created our own definition so as to avoid duplicating national definitions. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | paragraph 109 of NPPF to seek "net gains in biodiversity" and as such should be reworded to ensure that new green infrastructure not only will not cause adverse impacts on biodiversity but actually seeks to enhance. | | | | |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151101 | Green Party This policy clearly sets out that only exceptional circumstances would allow consideration of loss of land which is "designated wildlife site or providing important biodiversity value" With respect to the development plot identified at Murton, the existence of both designated wildlife site (biodiversity offset for development elsewhere in the borough) and targets for biodiversity enhancement in the site within the 2010 Biodiversity Action Plan, the proposed development is inconsistent with these requirements. Additionally, they are inconsistent with Section 118 of the NPPF which requires that any planning should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity. | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. The Golden Plover mitigation site is not a designated wildlife site. It is proposed that the area of mitigation land is relocated to a similar suitable site in order to allow the effective delivery of housing policies within the Local Plan. Work for this is currently ongoing and will be resolved through the masterplanning process. Development will not take place without this issue being appropriately resolved. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805471 | | | LP20151127 | This seems contradictory as you are not maintaining the green infrastructure at all in fact you are seeking to remove a significant area of green infrastructure in the proposed housing developments around NE12 area | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. As stated in policy DM8.2 'where development proposals could adversely affect green infrastructure, permission will only be granted where: e. Alternative provision, equivalent to or better than in terms of its quantity and quality, can be provided in equally accessible locations which maintains or creates new green infrastructure connections; or f. the proposed development would be ancillary to use of the green infrastructure and the benefits to green infrastructure would outweigh any loss of open area. All Local Plan Polices | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | should be read as a whole. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2. | |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151255 | DM8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure Our Clients supports this policy, in particular the comment relating to: Where development proposals could adversely affect green infrastructure, permission will only be granted where: "ç "e: alternative provision, equivalent to or better than in terms of its quality and quality, can be provided in equally accessible locations which maintains or creates new green infrastructure connections; or "ç f: the proposed development would be ancillary to use of the green infrastructure and the benefits to green infrastructure would outweigh any loss of open area€™. Our Client suggests that the significant Green Infrastructure buffers, as illustrated in Proposals map, could prevent maximising identified development sites, which might in turn make some smaller sites unviable. An applicant should work with the LPA to determine the effect of a proposal upon an area of Green Infrastructure, such as a wildlife corridor. If a development proposal has an effect upon these Green Infrastructure areas (including buffers) then mitigation measures could be sought and additional locations could be provided, which would still be part of a network of multifunctional green space. | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. Although some designated sites have wildlife corridors/buffers running through them there is no reason to consider why these sites could not accommodate future development whilst adhering to the policies and maintaining a linked workable network of wildlife corridors. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899452 | | | LP20151278 | I get the impression that the green belt is protected but other green areas are at risk of development. Despite council promises/wishes there does not appear to be much to stop developers building on green sites if they want to. It looks like there will be | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comment noted. As outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (para 79) 'The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. Paragraph 83 of the NPPF states 'once established, Green Belt boundaries should | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | no buffer zone between West Monkseaton and Shiremoor, just Murton sitting like an island in the middle of new development. The green spaces are at risk of being chipped away at. Looks like The Rising Sun is going to be another island surrounded by houses. | | | only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan'. As outline in the consultation (Policy AS7.4) for the strategic site allocations such as Murton, 'Green infrastructure corridors must be safeguarded through Strategic Allocations. Major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identity, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside and biodiversity'. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2. | |
| 899455 | | | LP20151283 | The proposal to build houses on the remaining green fields along Whitley Road (sites 17, 111, 139 and 110) does not support the aims of this policy. With the new developments since the last consultation, this area has had enough. There is a green break between Killingworth and Forest Hall, so there should be one between Forest Hall/Benton and Wallsend. Please safeguard this land. | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. All the policies outlined in the Local Plan (2015) must be read as a whole. For instance policy DM8.2 (NOW 5.2)states that 'the loss of any part of the green infrastructure network will only be considered in the following exceptional circumstances...'. 'Where development proposals could adversely affect green infrastructure, permission will only be granted where (e) alternative provision, equivalent to or better than in terms of its quantity and quality, can be provided in equally accessible locations which maintains or creates new green infrastructure connections; or (f) the proposed development would be ancillary to use of the green infrastructure and the benefits to green infrastructure would outweigh any loss of open area. The Local Plan must strike a balance between the economic, social and environmental needs of the borough. . The | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development, but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. | |
| 899459 | | | LP20151289 | The site at Murton in particular is of great community amenity value, with the paths across the site used by walkers, runners, dog walkers, horse riders and cyclists on a regular basis. As such this land represents a major green infrastructure element for the areas of Murton, New York, Shiremoor, Preston and Monkseaton which would be lost or seriously compromised by the development of large scale housing on the site. | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comment noted. Policy AS4.4A-C outlines the requirement for strategic sites such as Murton. It states that 'A concept framework must be prepared jointly by the landowner/s and North Tyneside Council; this will be used as a basis for further comprehensive master planning. Within this master planning Green infrastructure corridors must be safeguarded through Strategic Allocations. Major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identity, maintaining amenity space, access to the countryside and biodiversity. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899469 | | | LP20151290 | This policy clearly sets out that only exceptional circumstances would allow consideration of loss of land which is "designated wildlife site or providing important biodiversity value" With respect to the development plot identified at Murton, the existence of both designated wildlife site | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. The Golden Plover mitigation site is not a designated wildlife site. It is proposed that the area of mitigation land is relocated to a similar suitable site in order to allow the effective delivery of housing policies within the Local Plan. Work for this is currently ongoing and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | (biodiversity offset for development elsewhere in the borough) and targets for biodiversity enhancement in the site within the 2010 Biodiversity Action Plan, the proposed development is inconsistent with these requirements. Additionally, they are inconsistent with Section 118 of the NPPF which requires that any planning should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity. | | | will be resolved through the masterplanning process. Development will not take place without this issue being appropriately resolved. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2. | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151355 | Policy DM8:2. Protection of Green Infrastructure. CPRE supports this policy. However, we are concerned, based on experience elsewhere, that clause e) allowing the offer of alternative provision may lead to inadequate or otherwise unsatisfactory outcomes, especially in terms of longer term maintenance. We propose that such provision should be only acceptable in "exceptional circumstances" . CPRE are also of the view that it not desirable to disrupt wildlife communities in any circumstances. Reference to the capacity of Neighbourhood Plans to deliver this framework policy e.g. through the designation of Local Green Spaces would be helpful. | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comments noted . The first line of Policy DM8.2 already states 'the loss of any part of the green infrastructure network will only be considered in the following <u>exceptional circumstances</u> '. The policy as allows for the possibility of better green infrastructure provision. Neighbourhood plans do not soley cover the designation of green space. They cover a much larger spectrum which is outlined within National Planning Policy and Guidance. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2 | No amendments proposed. |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151503 | These comments are submitted having regard to the comment in the Local Plan Consultation 2013 and Sites Analysis 2015 Schedule that land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA ref 298) is subject to an application to designate the site as Local Green Space. Nexus object to the designation of land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA ref 298) as Local Green Space / Green Space / Open Space for a number of reasons including; 1 Planning Practice Guidance (007 | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) (now Policies S1.4 and S4.1). Given that the majority of the site was until very recently used for railway sidings the brownfield context is acknowledged. This site has been assessed through the SHLAA (Site 298) and was included as a potential development site in the 2013 of the plan. However, following further assessment | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>ref ID : 37-007-20140306) states that designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. The designation of land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton as Local Green Space is not consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. As set out in the SHLAA, the site is 100 percent brownfield. A core planning principle is to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided it is not of high environmental value. Land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton is not of high environmental value. Its reuse should be encouraged and it should be allocated and developed in preference to Greenfield sites listed in policy S7.3. A parallel representation has been submitted to policy S7.3. 2 North Tyneside Council's Green Space Strategy February 2015 assesses the value of the site 'low' and the quality of the site 'low', Map 1. In the circumstances the site is acknowledged not to be of particular value. The rationale behind the application for Local Green Space designation has to be questioned acknowledging the guidance in Planning Practice Guidance (007 ref ID : 37-007-20140306) that the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines the aim of plan making, namely to identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified needs. The rationale behind the application for the Local Green Space designation particularly has to be questioned acknowledging the statement in</p> | | | <p>through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. As a result the site will not be selected as preferred residential allocation.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>paragraph 1 of the Benton Triangle Community's website applications' page that, 'there is a risk that it will be used for housing' http://www.bentontriangle.com/#!applications/coxh. 3 North Tyneside Council's Green Space Strategy February 2015 includes Objective 9 : Design of Green Spaces. This sets out a number of criteria as to how Green Spaces should be designed. The site does not meet these for reasons including the site is not accessible by all, access being through a fence and down a steep bank, it suffering disuse, it being unlit, there being evidence of antisocial behaviour on the site and that there are not any linkages through. The poor quality of the site is acknowledged in the Local Plan Consultation Sites Analysis report 2015 which under the heading Officer Response details that the site 'has remained largely inaccessible and unused'. 4 It is noted that in the application for the designation of the site as Local Green Space there is reference to allotments on the site. Whilst historically there might have been allotments on a portion of the site this has not been the case for some years, a matter acknowledged in the Council's Allotment Strategy 2009 "" 2015 which records at the time the document was written they were not in use and this remains the case now. The reference to allotment gardens on the Proposals Map and on the Sites Analysis 2015 should be deleted. 5 The site is in Nexus's ownership. The proposal to 'create open space' requires Nexus' agreement otherwise the area will remain largely inaccessible and unused as it currently</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | is as acknowledged in the Officer Response in the Local Plan Consultation 2013 and Sites Analysis 2015. This goes to the deliverability of the proposal, policies amongst things having to be deliverable if the Plan is to be sound, NPPF para 182. Nexus' position is that the creation of open space in isolation is not deliverable. That said as has been detailed previously, if the site was subject of a comprehensive development package including open space and a residential development of around 50 dwellings in accordance with the Potential Sites Background Paper, there would be an opportunity to provide an overall scheme which is deliverable, in the public interest and amongst other things would result in high value and high quality open space meeting the standards in Objective 9 of the Council's Green Space Strategy 2015 | | | | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151699 | I welcome the recognition that if development impinges on Green Infrastructure that alternative provision should maintain green infrastructure connections. Throughout the document, the meaning of "sustainable" is getting confused with appropriate levels of growth/development. May I bring your attention to The UK Sustainable Development Strategy Securing the Future that sets out five "guiding principles" of sustainable development: living within the planet's environmental limits; ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; achieving a sustainable economy; promoting good governance; and using sound science | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. A balance must be struck between economic, social and environmental sustainability. In line with the NPPF the Green infrastructure policies outline the need to protect, manage, enhance and create. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | responsibly. Sustainability requires us to conserve and enhance our natural environment; significant parts of this document contradict this aim. Whilst this statement is no longer applicable to this policy, This is relevant to the wider document. I have concerns over the last sentence in this policy. The LPA are not "planning positively" (paragraph 114 of NPPF) for networks of biodiversity by requiring new green infrastructure to only "not cause adverse impacts" . This policy should be looking to meet the aims of paragraph 109 of NPPF to seek "net gains in biodiversity€ and as such should be reworded to ensure that new green infrastructure not only will not cause adverse impacts on biodiversity but actually seeks to enhance. | | | | |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151825 | We support policies S/8.1 and DM/8.2 that seek to protect and provide Green Infrastructure, however we continue to recommend that the text relating green infrastructure recognises the benefits Green Infrastructure can contribute to WFD objectives. In particular in managing urban run-off and improving water quality. We consider this is particularly necessary due to the Water Framework Directive (WFD). WFD is European legislation designed to protect and enhance the quality of our rivers, lakes, streams, groundwater, estuaries and coastal waters, with a particular focus on ecology. WFD sets out the need to protect and improve the water environment in its totality. It applies to all surface water bodies, including rivers, streams, lakes, estuaries and canals, | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Following designation as open space through the Local Plan, any proposal for alternative use of the site, including for residential development, would be assessed on individual merit in light of relevant policies. In this context, in addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM4.5. Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for development to meet the overall requirement for new homes to 2032. As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--------------------------|
| | | | | coastal waters, and all groundwater bodies. The Directive has two main objectives: "ç It sets a target for all waterbodies to achieve "good status" by 2015. "ç No deterioration in current status. Historically, urban rivers have been used as a convenient route for disposing of society's waste, with effluent from industry and sewage damaging the environment for people and wildlife. Despite the great progress made in tackling the harmful effects of urban pollution, many of North Tyneside's watercourses still fail to meet the water quality standards necessary to support a healthy environment. In North Tyneside, urban run-off has been identified as one of the main reasons some of the rivers fail to meet the quality standards set by the Water Framework Directive. This is of particular importance for the Sandy's Letch, the Seaton Burn and the Brierdene. Green Infrastructure is of particular importance in addressing these issues. | | | and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151946 | Natural England supports this policy. | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2 | No amendments proposed. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152044 | Policy DM8.2 sets out the policy position that the Council wish to protect the loss of Green Infrastructure within the authority area. Persimmon supports this policy direction however have questions as to the overall scope and application of this policy in practice. The policy map provided alongside this consultation sets only one area (Coastal Change Management Area) however the policy is worded to cover "any part of the | | DM 8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure | Comments noted. The map key was in error and hence presented confusion when reading the policy. The map has now been amended. As stated within the policy loss of <u>any</u> part of the green infrastructure network will only be considered in the following exceptional circumstances...' Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.2 | Map amendments auctioned |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|------------------------|
| | | | | green infrastructure network" this seems much wider than shown on the proposals map. The policy as worded needs clarity as to the scope and in what situations this would be applied. | | | | |
| 396412 | Northumb erland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATI ON | LP2015504 | The Northumberland Wildlife Trust welcomes a policy that states that all households should have access to semi-natural green space, however it is considered that there is a need to specify a minimum area (as has been done for "accessible, free and useable green space"). Paragraph 8.11 Whilst we welcome the acknowledgement of the document that access to semi-natural green space is not consistent throughout the borough and there is a need to increase its accessibility, we question how development on large areas of open green space is going to achieve this. NWT welcomes the changes made to this policy (in particular points c and d), however we would question whether or not these figures are actually achievable, given that proposed areas allocated for development including existing developments and the lack of strategic plan for biodiversity,. NWT therefore seeks a strategic biodiversity plan, prepared in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, to include areas allocated for biodiversity (including green infrastructure, on and off site mitigation and compensation). This would result in a more effective and achievable plan. This should link to priorities identified by the Local Nature Partnership. | | DM 8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards | Comments noted. A strategic biodiversity plan is not considered appropriate at this stage and will arise through the planning application process. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.3 | No amendments proposed |
| 396412 | Northumb erland Wildlife | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATI | LP2015547 | The LPA should plan positively for biodiversity and produce a targeted, strategic plan for areas that would be suitable for off-site | | DM 8.3 Green Space Provision and | Comments with regard to the current physical quality of the site are acknowledged, as is the limited accessibility. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | Trust | ON | | mitigation. This plan should produce a series of linked areas that would be suitable and produce a net gain for biodiversity across the borough to meet the requirements of NPPF. Again we make reference to paragraph 114 of NPPF that requires LPAs to "set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure€ . The mapping of areas for habitat creation and retention (by a local partnership) is required by NPPF paragraph 117. This has not happened. | | Standards | As referenced, the Local Plan Policies Map outlines that this land is 'allotment gardens'; however, this label is on the Ordnance Survey 1:10000 scale 'base map', a record which is maintained and update by that independent organisation. It is recognised that the site is not used as allotments and has not been for a number of years. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.3 | |
| 587121 | | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015971 | We have a concern about your proposed designation of land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA reference 298) as "Local Green Space" , and will be sending you a separate response in connection with this issue. | | DM 8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards | The proposals for a Local Green Space designation have arisen from the representations of Benton Triangle Community and, as a result, it is considered necessary to undertake an assessment of the appropriateness of such a designation through the Local Plan process. However, following further appraisal it has been concluded that this site does not meet the criteria for designation as formal Local Green Space. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 898969 | | | LP2015999 | When is the council going to tackle the issue of dog foul in the area? There seems little point developing a plan when it is undermined by this blight on society. | | DM 8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards | The Local Plan is necessary to guide future development in the Borough. The Council's Street Care team work to tackle dog fouling in the Borough. Issues can be reported to this team via an online form or telephone. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151256 | SM8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards Our Client supports the LPAs proposed policy to provide a range of easily accessible play | | DM 8.3 Green Space Provision and | The policy will be updated to be more flexible. It will direct to the Green Space Strategy as a guide but will not repeat the | Policy now makes it clear that new development should sustain or improve |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | spaces; however our Client has reservations in regards to the viability of the suggested provision. The proposed policy does not specifically indicate whether the provision of LEAP/ NEAP/ SEAP provision is for all households existing and new development, or whether this is only for new residential development. Our Client would request that there is a higher proportion of high quality play space, but with less strict distance provision, for example within 600 " " 1,000 m of a household, would be more beneficial than various sizes and types of play space at various distances, as high quality provision is likely to attract the majority of users. Therefore quality, not quantity is more important (NPPF, 73); although accessibility to open and play spaces and places is still required. Our Client would also suggest that play spaces do not always require play equipment, open community spaces can be as efficient in attracting people and families to utilise open space. This would also attract various sections of the community and not specifically provide for only children and families. The NPPF (69) aims to involve various sections of the community to be able to access open space and community provisions. This proposed policy should be amended to be less specific and more flexible to meet the needs of the wider community. | | Standards | exact standards of that document. Nevertheless, the standards within the Green Space Strategy are considered reasonable. For play areas, they are based on the Fields in Trust (formally the National Playing Fields Association) play area categories and their characteristics, but have been adapted to meet local circumstances, as established in the Council's former Play Policy and Strategy and previous versions of the Green Space Strategy. It is considered that equipped areas for play are important in addition to general open space, which is also recognised. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.3 | current levels of provision rather than have to achieve 100% provision. Policy now makes reference to the Green Space Strategy rather than repeat its exact standards. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151356 | Policy DM8:3. CPRE welcomes this policy. Arguably allotment provision could be incorporated under the heading of amenity green space. | | DM 8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards | Comments noted. Allotments are not included within this policy because they do not fall within the definition of free and accessible open space, the provision of such places this policy aims to secure. Allotments | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | are however, considered part of the GI network and their protection and enhancement are supported through those relevant policies. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.3 | |
| 464572 | Landowner | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20151504 | <p>These comments are submitted having regard to the comment in the Local Plan Consultation 2013 and Sites Analysis 2015 Schedule that land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA ref 298) is subject to an application to designate the site as Local Green Space. Nexus object to the designation of land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton (SHLAA ref 298) as Local Green Space / Green Space / Open Space for a number of reasons including; 1 Planning Practice Guidance (007 ref ID : 37-007-20140306) states that designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. The designation of land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton as Local Green Space is not consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. As set out in the SHLAA, the site is 100 percent brownfield. A core planning principle is to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided it is not of high environmental value. Land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton is not of high environmental value. Its reuse should be encouraged and it should be allocated and developed in preference to Greenfield sites listed in policy S7.3. A parallel representation has been submitted to policy S7.3. 2 North Tyneside Council's Green Space</p> | | DM 8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards | <p>The redevelopment of brownfield sites is prioritised through the Local Plan, including in Policies DM2.2 (now S1.4) (NOW1.4) and S7.1 (now S4.1) (Now 4.1). Given that the majority of the site was until very recently used for railway sidings the brownfield context is acknowledged. This site has been assessed through the SHLAA (Site 298) and was included as a potential development site in the 2013 of the plan. However, following further assessment through the Local Plan process, including taking account of information from relevant experts and representations to this consultation exercise, it has been determined that the most appropriate designation for this site is as open space. As a result the site will not be selected as a preferred residential allocation. Following designation as open space through the Local Plan, any proposal for alternative use of the site, including for residential development, would be assessed on individual merit in light of relevant policies. In this context, in addition to allocated sites, an allowance is also made for the delivery of small sites (those of less than 5 units) and windfall sites. These are not allocated on a site-specific basis but are deemed suitable when judged against the criteria of Policy DM4.5. Supply from these sources will continue to come forward for</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Strategy February 2015 assesses the value of the site 'low' and the quality of the site 'low', Map 1. In the circumstances the site is acknowledged not to be of particular value. The rationale behind the application for Local Green Space designation has to be questioned acknowledging the guidance in Planning Practice Guidance (007 ref ID : 37-007-20140306) that the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines the aim of plan making, namely to identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified needs. The rationale behind the application for the Local Green Space designation particularly has to be questioned acknowledging the statement in paragraph 1 of the Benton Triangle Community's website applications' page that, 'there is a risk that it will be used for housing' http://www.bentontriangle.com/#!applications/coxh. 3 North Tyneside Council's Green Space Strategy February 2015 includes Objective 9 : Design of Green Spaces. This sets out a number of criteria as to how Green Spaces should be designed. The site does not meet these for reasons including the site is not accessible by all, access being through a fence and down a steep bank, it suffering disuse, it being unlit, there being evidence of antisocial behaviour on the site and that there are not any linkages through. The poor quality of the site is acknowledged in the Local Plan Consultation Sites Analysis report 2015 which under the heading Officer Response details that the site 'has remained largely inaccessible and unused'. 4 It is noted that in</p> | | | <p>development to meet the overall requirement for new homes to 2032. As part of any proposal for development, a planning application must include an assessment to consider the current role, use and accessibility of this area of open space and whether there is a need for alternative provision in the local area. Such an assessment would have to justify the loss of open space and, if necessary, identify new space or improvements to other existing provision. The comments with regard to the Green Space Strategy are acknowledged and it is correct that this site has been assessed as 'low' in terms of both value and quality in the latest of the GSS. The proposals for a Local Green Space designation have arisen from the representations of the Benton Triangle Community Action Group and, as a result, it was considered necessary to undertake an assessment of the appropriateness of such a designation through the Local Plan process. However, following further assessment in accordance with the criteria provided in the NPPF, it has been recommended that this site does not meet the criteria for designation as formal Local Green Space. Comments with regard to the current physical quality of the site are acknowledged, as is the limited accessibility. As referenced, the Local Plan Policies Map outlines that this land is 'allotment gardens'; however, this label is on the Ordnance Survey 1:10000 scale 'base map', a record which is maintained and update by that independent organisation. It is recognised</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>the application for the designation of the site as Local Green Space there is reference to allotments on the site. Whilst historically there might have been allotments on a portion of the site this has not been the case for some years, a matter acknowledged in the Council's Allotment Strategy 2009- 2015 which records at the time the document was written they were not in use and this remains the case now. The reference to allotment gardens on the Proposals Map and on the Sites Analysis 2015 should be deleted. 5 The site is in Nexus's ownership. The proposal to 'create open space' requires Nexus' agreement otherwise the area will remain largely inaccessible and unused as it currently is as acknowledged in the Officer Response in the Local Plan Consultation 2013 and Sites Analysis 2015. This goes to the deliverability of the proposal, policies amongst things having to be deliverable if the Plan is to be sound, NPPF para 182. Nexus' position is that the creation of open space in isolation is not deliverable. That said as has been detailed previously, if the site was subject of a comprehensive development package including open space and a residential development of around 50 dwellings in accordance with the Potential Sites Background Paper, there would be an opportunity to provide an overall scheme which is deliverable, in the public interest and amongst other things would result in high value and high quality open space meeting the standards in Objective 9 of the Council's Green Space Strategy 2015</p> | | | <p>that the site is not used as allotments and has not been for a number of years. It is not considered that designation as open space would compromise the deliverability of Local Plan strategy. Not all designated open space is publically accessible and therefore, even though this site is in private ownership, this decision is felt to be appropriate. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.3</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| 899297 | | | LP20151700 | I note that there have been changes made to this policy (in particular points c and d), however would question whether or not these figures are actually achievable, given that proposed areas allocated for development including existing developments and the lack of strategic plan for biodiversity,. . This could be achieved by a strategic biodiversity plan, prepared in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, to include areas allocated for biodiversity (including green infrastructure, on and off site mitigation and compensation). This would result in a more effective and achievable plan. This should link to priorities identified by the Local Nature Partnership. | | DM 8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards | Comments noted. A strategic biodiversity plan is not considered appropriate at this stage and will arise through the planning application process. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151947 | Natural England supports this policy. | | DM 8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152045 | Policy DM8.3 sets out the Council's approach to developments in proximity to types of open space and play facilities. Firstly we consider this policy is confusing in title as it firstly relates to play provision and then secondly to provision and access to open spaces. We suggest that this policy is split to make it clearer. Secondly the standards relate to all households being within the specified distances to the open space and play facilities, it is considered that a very small proportion of the existing households accord with this standard and would like to see how the Council will seek to bring the existing housing stock up to standard? Thirdly for new developments these policies set a standard | | DM 8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards | Comments noted. The policy will be updated to be more flexible and clear. It will direct to the Green Space Strategy as a guide but will not repeat the exact standards of that document. Green space definitions are within the Green Space Strategy, along with their current locations. This forms part of the evidence base. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.3 | Policy now makes it clear that new development should sustain or improve current levels of provision rather than have to achieve 100% provision. Policy now makes reference to the Green Space Strategy rather than repeat its exact standards. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>which is overly proscriptive, onerous and confusing to understanding and apply in practice. It seems unreasonable to expect improved access to all these forms given that the existing housing stock does not. Similarly the policy sets the requirement to meet all types of play facilities meaning new developments would need to provide onsite (if not within target distance) all seven types of play provision, and significant proportions of open space. For the play provision the policy needs to set a hierarchy looking to provide the best type of play facility on site if that site does not fall within the allocated catchment. For the open space policy there should be more clarity as to what the Council considers "parks" and "natural or semi-natural green space" and "accessible, free usable green space" and to clearly show this on the allocations map or at least within the evidence base. At present it is impossible to assess future development sites and how this policy would effect their develop ability / viability. Finally this policy sets out that non compliance with this standard will result in the seeking of mitigation, which not withstanding our misgivings above makes sense however the form and type of mitigation is unclear, additional clarity should be provided as to the form and type of mitigation sought.</p> | | | | |
| 892176 | | RESIDENT | LP2015246 | <p>Please send the swans back from Killingworth Lake to the reserve at Gosforth Park. Organise a regatta or try bird scarers.</p> | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | <p>Comments noted. Swan management is beyond the scope of the Local Plan. The relevant teams of the Council are aware of the issues. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| 463028 | | | LP2015262 | The section about conserving enhancing and managing wildlife corridors is at odds with North Tyneside's suggested sites for development. The map shows wildlife corridors going through three areas that either have planning permission for houses, or are marked for development: - Site 17 (Station Road West) - The site opposite this i.e. East of Station Road and West of the Rising Sun, where building has already started. - Holystone (despite a 3500 signature petition), between the bypass and the A19, next to the Stonebrook pub and hotel. This makes no sense at all, as the development will block the wildlife corridor. Is the wildlife supposed to go through peoples' gardens? North Tyneside need to rethink this and stop development in this area. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | The wildlife corridor map in the Local Plan outlines the general direction of the corridors. A more specific Wildlife Corridor Map is provided within North Tyneside's Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). This map shows the exact location of the Wildlife Corridors. Master plans of proposed housing developments have been assessed during the review of the Wildlife Corridors to ensure that they cover key areas. Private gardens are a very important wildlife asset and help connect various networks. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 892786 | | RESIDENT | LP2015288 | I have great concerns about the vital preservation of the wildlife corridors that look as if they will be compromised at Gosforth Wood; Killingworth Moor; Backworth; West Allotment; Rising Sun; and, Murton. Developments and transport improvements will have a devastating effect. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. North Tyneside's Green Infrastructure Strategy outlines the importance of Wildlife Corridors. In order to support the future development and enhancement of GI in North Tyneside a number of recommendations have been created to encourage the creation of appropriate, well maintained, multifunctional, quality provision. Amendments made to Local Plan to provide further policy and guidance on wildlife corridors. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | Amendments actioned. New Wildlife Corridor policy and related text. |
| 893932 | | RESIDENT | LP2015374 | I strongly support the designation of the Benton curve as a wildlife corridor. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 893941 | | RESIDENT | LP2015377 | I strongly support the designation of the Benton curve as a wildlife corridor. I have lived at the following address for 57 years and many many years ago I agreed for the same thing to happen to the curve but nothing came of it until now, thank you. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 893944 | | RESIDENT | LP2015379 | I strongly support the designation of Benton curve as a wildlife corridor. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 893964 | | RESIDENT | LP2015381 | I am emailing to record my strong support for the local authority's intention to designate the Benton Curve, a section of disused railway adjoining The Oval in Benton, as a wildlife corridor. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 894055 | | RESIDENT | LP2015385 | I strongly support the designation of the Benton curve as a wildlife corridor. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 895005 | | RESIDENT | LP2015474 | During the current consultation period I wish to register my support for the North Tyneside Council plan to designate the disused railway in Benton, also known as the Benton Curve, as a wildlife corridor. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 806166 | | RESIDENT | LP2015477 | I am writing to object strongly to the North Tyneside Local Plan for the following reasons: "ç Proposed wildlife corridors are not based on sound assessment and are compromised by planned development and new roads. They do not meet NPPF requirements for establishing coherent ecological networks. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. There is no definitive methodology for producing a Borough ecological network map. However | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>we have drawn heavily on external resources, including National Planning Policy and Natural England's work. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4</p> <p>Alongside the Local Plan a number of additional evidence based studies and guides have been developed, including the North Tyneside Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). As part of this strategy North Tyneside's Wildlife corridors have been reviewed following significant changes in the landscape since the previous GI strategy and UDP. In order to produce North Tyneside's Wildlife Enhancement Corridors (WEC), for the emerging Local Plan it is essential that a baseline map with all existing green space was produced. This is in line with Natural England's recommendations for opportunity mapping and habitat networks. Working with organisations and individuals in particular with North Tyneside's Ecologist, existing designated sites and valuable habitats were first mapped on GIS. Clusters of habitats and sites which form the core wildlife areas for the Borough were then identified. This then led onto plotting network links between the core areas. Potential buffers, links and stepping stones were created to produce large habitat areas, and to create a functional wildlife network. Outside the network, wildlife habitats and sites will continue to be managed and protected, and can be buffered by habitat creation and appropriate management.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | It is recognised that the additional development proposed in the Local Plan could have indirect impacts on biodiversity and the use of open space for recreation. In preparing site allocations, North Tyneside Council has considered the potential impact of each site allocation on biodiversity and green spaces assets. Where new development occurs North Tyneside Council will seek on or off-site provision resulting from recreational pressure on existing Green Infrastructure sites, when practical. | |
| 806166 | | RESIDENT | LP2015482 | I am writing to object strongly to the North Tyneside Local Plan for the following reasons: "ç I understand that Signet, an American developer, wants to build a large leisure centre opposite the entrance to Gosforth Nature Reserve. This site has become a natural extension of the reserve for wildlife, including breeding birds. However, Signet is planning to bulldoze the complete site on Thursday March 19th, even before the planning application has been considered. This is totally outrageous. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. The Local Plan designates sites 10 and 11 (located near Gosforth Business park) for employment land. North Tyneside's Development Management team will assess any individual applications that come forward through the normal planning application process which will assess any impact on biodiversity and geodiversity. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015506 | NPPF requires LPAs in paragraph 114 to set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity. This statement remains current. Whilst this policy meets the requirement for protection and enhancement, there is no reference to habitat creation, particularly for wildlife links (point d). The Northumberland Wildlife Trust | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. North Tyneside Local Planning Authority and NWT are working closely together in order to reach the right balance between development and biodiversity/geodiversity needs. Opening sentence of Policy has been amended to include creation. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | Policy S8.4 amended 'The Borough's biodiversity and geodiversity resources will be protected, created, enhanced and managed having regard to their relative significance. Priority will be given to:' |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| | | | | <p>therefore considers this policy to be incomplete and not to meet the requirements of NPPF. NWT welcomes the alteration to this part of the policy to include the creation of new linking habitats (point d). The Northumberland Wildlife Trust has concerns that point "a" of this policy only looks to protect statutory and non-statutory designated sites. Again this falls short of the requirements of NPPF to create, protect, enhance and manage of networks of biodiversity. As does point "c" that does not include reference to managing or creating local sites of wildlife corridors. NWT welcomes the inclusion of point d, however would like to see more references to creation of wildlife corridors and biodiversity resources particularly in the opening sentence of this policy. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust has concerns that other policies and allocations in this document have conflicting aims with the Policy S/8.4, thus making such actions as protecting and enhancing wildlife links unlikely to be achievable. This statement remains current. "Point b" refers to the National Biodiversity Action Plan. This has now been superseded by The 'UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework'. The correct document needs to be referenced here. NWT welcomes the alteration made in reference to this comment.</p> | | | | |
| 895340 | | RESIDENT | LP2015529 | <p>5) Wildlife Corridors Green wildlife corridors are important for nature, but they are also desirable routes for foot, bicycle and horse access "ç With the exception of Metro lines, wildlife corridors are particularly synergetic</p> | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | <p>Comments noted. North Tyneside Local Planning Authority Wildlife Corridors have been planned in line with The National Planning Policy Framework as outlined in paragraph 112 'identify and map</p> | Amendment actioned |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>with footpaths and bridleways. "ç Part of the special character of Murton and Earsdon are its horses and stables. "ç Much dog walking takes place in the fields around Murton to the health advantage of dog owners "ç Recreational walking is hugely preferable if not done on the roadway's pavement.. "ç Many designated wildlife corridors are Wagonways and for historical reasons these tend to run North/South. Few significant routes exist East/West. "ç The designation of a wildlife corridor from Centurion Golf Club through to Silverlink Park is good. However there is a missing link between Silverlink Park and Murton. "ç A green wildlife bridleway linking Murton with Silverlink Park would contribute much to the amenities of all those in the centre of the LA area and further enhance the special character of Murton.</p> <p>ACTION 1: Future wildlife corridors are planned not just for wildlife, but also to enable non-motorised traffic route in a green, non-polluted, quiet environment ACTION 2: A wildlife corridor with non-motor access be added so as to link Murton with Silverlink Park.</p> | | | <p>components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation'. Action 1- Care must be taken with regards to multi use areas as they are not always complimentary to one another. Action 2-The Wildlife Corridor map has been amended to add an additional link from Murton to Silverlink. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4</p> | |
| 895340 | | RESIDENT | LP2015530 | <p>6) Wildlife Corridor Access The synergistic benefits of Wildlife Corridors are lost if non-motor access is not possible "ç Despite rights of way on either side of the A19 at NZ310698, there is no safe pedestrian, bicycle or equine access across the busy A19. "ç If the rural amenities around Murton are being lost, then greater use and easier non-motor access to Rising Sun Country Park and Nature Reserve needs to be possible. "ç Linking access to</p> | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | <p>Comments noted. Wildlife Corridors are not required to have non-motor access. Erosion caused by walkers and cyclists can be an issue to Wildlife. Both vehicular and non-motorised access for strategic areas such as Murton will develop through master planning stages however suggestions for access routes have been noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| | | | | Rising Sun and Silverlink Parks would bring benefits to both. "ç Access from the eastern end of the Murton wildlife corridor looks problematic. Access from Rake Lane would ensure the integrity of the corridor for non-motor use and increase the visual amenity of Rake Lane Hospital. ACTION 1: A tunnel or bridge is built across the A19 at West Allotment to link the recreational and wildlife areas of Rising Sun and Silverlink Park, ACTION 2: The wildlife corridor at the eastern end of the Murton development site should be brought slightly southwards so that it can permit non-motor access to the corridor from Rake Lane. At present the plan suggests that public access (if any) would only be possible across school property. | | | | |
| 895341 | | RESIDENT | LP2015535 | 5) Wildlife Corridors Green wildlife corridors are important for nature, but they are also desirable routes for foot, bicycle and horse access "ç With the exception of Metro lines, wildlife corridors are particularly synergetic with footpaths and bridleways. "ç Part of the special character of Murton and Earsdon are its horses and stables. "ç Much dog walking takes place in the fields around Murton to the health advantage of dog owners "ç Recreational walking is hugely preferable if not done on the roadway's pavement.. "ç Many designated wildlife corridors are Wagonways and for historical reasons these tend to run North/South. Few significant routes exist East/West. "ç The designation of a wildlife corridor from Centurion Golf Club through to Silverlink Park is good. However there is a missing link between Silverlink Park | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. The Local Plan has designated its Wildlife Corridors in line with paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that planning policies should 'identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation'. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | Amendment actioned |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | and Murton. "ç A green wildlife bridleway linking Murton with Silverlink Park would contribute much to the amenities of all those in the centre of the LA area and further enhance the special character of Murton. ACTION 1: Future wildlife corridors are planned not just for wildlife, but also to enable non-motorised traffic route in a green, non-polluted, quiet environment ACTION 2: A wildlife corridor with non-motor access be added so as to link Murton with Silverlink Park. | | | | |
| 895341 | | RESIDENT | LP2015536 | 6) Wildlife Corridor Access The synergistic benefits of Wildlife Corridors are lost if non-motor access is not possible "ç Despite rights of way on either side of the A19 at NZ310698, there is no safe pedestrian, bicycle or equine access across the busy A19. "ç If the rural amenities around Murton are being lost, then greater use and easier non-motor access to Rising Sun Country Park and Nature Reserve needs to be possible. "ç Linking access to Rising Sun and Silverlink Parks would bring benefits to both. "ç Access from the eastern end of the Murton wildlife corridor looks problematic. Access from Rake Lane would ensure the integrity of the corridor for non-motor use and increase the visual amenity of Rake Lane Hospital. ACTION 1: A tunnel or bridge is built across the A19 at West Allotment to link the recreational and wildlife areas of Rising Sun and Silverlink Park, ACTION 2: The wildlife corridor at the eastern end of the Murton development site should be brought slightly southwards so that it can permit non-motor access to the corridor from | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. The Local Plan has designated its Wildlife Corridors in line with paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that planning policies should 'identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation'. Wildlife Corridors do not necessarily incorporate human/non-motorised access as it is not always beneficial for Wildlife. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | Rake Lane. At present the plan suggests that public access (if any) would only be possible across school property. | | | | |
| 895384 | | RESIDENT | LP2015555 | My wife and I live beside the Benton Curve. We fully and strongly support your designation of it as a wildlife corridor. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 897295 | | RESIDENT | LP2015601 | Proposed wildlife corridors are not based on sound assessment and are compromised by planned development and new roads. They do not meet NPPF requirements for establishing coherent ecological networks. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | <p>Comments noted. Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. There is no definitive methodology for producing a Borough ecological network map. However we have drawn heavily on external resources, including National Planning Policy and Natural England's work.</p> <p>Alongside the Local Plan a number of additional evidence based studies and guides have been developed, including the North Tyneside Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). As part of this strategy North Tyneside's Wildlife corridors have been reviewed following significant changes in the landscape since the previous GI strategy and UDP. In order to produce North Tyneside's Wildlife Enhancement Corridors (WEC), for the emerging Local Plan it is essential that a baseline map with all existing green space was produced. This is in</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>line with Natural England's recommendations for opportunity mapping and habitat networks. Working with organisations and individuals in particular with North Tyneside's Ecologist, existing designated sites and valuable habitats were first mapped on GIS. Clusters of habitats and sites which form the core wildlife areas for the Borough were then identified. This then led onto plotting network links between the core areas. Potential buffers, links and stepping stones were created to produce large habitat areas, and to create a functional wildlife network. Outside the network, wildlife habitats and sites will continue to be managed and protected, and can be buffered by habitat creation and appropriate management. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4</p> <p>It is recognised that the additional development proposed in the Local Plan could have indirect impacts on biodiversity and the use of open space for recreation. In preparing site allocations, North Tyneside Council has considered the potential impact of each site allocation on biodiversity and green spaces assets. Where new development occurs North Tyneside Council will seek on or off-site provision resulting from recreational pressure on existing Green Infrastructure sites, when practical.</p> | |
| 897407 | | RESIDENT | LP2015625 | I would like to strongly support the designation of the 'Benton Curve' disused railway line as a wildlife corridor. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | Geodiversity | | |
| 897599 | | RESIDENT | LP2015636 | Wildlife corridors, as outlined in your plan, are already fragmented and are further threatened by planned development and new roads. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comment noted. Policies S8.4 (now S5.4), DM8.5 (now DM5.5) and DM8.6 (now DM5.6) are consistent with the guidance set out in the NPPF that advises planning authorities to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains where possible. Although some designated sites have wildlife corridors running through them there is no reason to consider why these sites could not accommodate future development whilst adhering to the policies and maintaining a linked workable network of wildlife corridors. Please note these policy numbers have changed but still remain within the plan. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP2015704 | Some of the wild life corridors are run along a section of electricity pylons some wildlife avoid these. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comment noted. Different kinds of Wildlife will be found in various areas both inside and outside of the designated Wildlife Corridors. For instance slow worms are known to often locate near railway lines, whilst other wildlife would not. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | Amendment to wildlife corridors at Killingworth |
| 898208 | | RESIDENT | LP2015725 | Proposed wildlife corridors are not based on sound evidence and are compromised by planned developments and new roads. They do not meet NPPF requirements for establishing coherent ecological networks. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. There is no definitive methodology for producing a | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>Borough ecological network map. However we have drawn heavily on external resources, including National Planning Policy and Natural England's work. Alongside the Local Plan a number of additional evidence based studies and guides have been developed, including the North Tyneside Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). As part of this strategy North Tyneside's Wildlife corridors have been reviewed following significant changes in the landscape since the previous GI strategy and UDP. In order to produce North Tyneside's Wildlife Enhancement Corridors (WEC), for the emerging Local Plan it is essential that a baseline map with all existing green space was produced. This is in line with Natural England's recommendations for opportunity mapping and habitat networks. Working with organisations and individuals in particular with North Tyneside's Ecologist, existing designated sites and valuable habitats were first mapped on GIS. Clusters of habitats and sites which form the core wildlife areas for the Borough were then identified. This then led onto plotting network links between the core areas. Potential buffers, links and stepping stones were created to produce large habitat areas, and to create a functional wildlife network. Outside the network, wildlife habitats and sites will continue to be managed and protected, and can be buffered by habitat creation and appropriate management. It is recognised that the additional development proposed in the Local Plan could have</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | indirect impacts on biodiversity and the use of open space for recreation. In preparing site allocations, North Tyneside Council has considered the potential impact of each site allocation on biodiversity and green spaces assets. Where new development occurs North Tyneside Council will seek on or off-site provision resulting from recreational pressure on existing Green Infrastructure sites, when practical. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4. | |
| 898230 | | RESIDENT | LP2015732 | Proposed wildlife corridors are not based on sound evidence and are compromised by planned developments and new roads. They do not meet NPPF requirements for establishing coherent ecological networks. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. There is no definitive methodology for producing a Borough ecological network map. However we have drawn heavily on external resources, including National Planning Policy and Natural England's work. Alongside the Local Plan a number of additional evidence based studies and guides have been developed, including the North Tyneside Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). As part of this strategy North Tyneside's Wildlife corridors have been reviewed following significant changes in the landscape since the previous GI strategy and UDP. In order to produce North Tyneside's Wildlife Enhancement Corridors (WEC), for | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>the emerging Local Plan it is essential that a baseline map with all existing green space was produced. This is in line with Natural England's recommendations for opportunity mapping and habitat networks. Working with organisations and individuals in particular with North Tyneside's Ecologist, existing designated sites and valuable habitats were first mapped on GIS. Clusters of habitats and sites which form the core wildlife areas for the Borough were then identified. This then led onto plotting network links between the core areas. Potential buffers, links and stepping stones were created to produce large habitat areas, and to create a functional wildlife network. Outside the network, wildlife habitats and sites will continue to be managed and protected, and can be buffered by habitat creation and appropriate management. It is recognised that the additional development proposed in the Local Plan could have indirect impacts on biodiversity and the use of open space for recreation. In preparing site allocations, North Tyneside Council has considered the potential impact of each site allocation on biodiversity and green spaces assets. Where new development occurs North Tyneside Council will seek on or off-site provision resulting from recreational pressure on existing Green Infrastructure sites, when practical. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4.</p> | |
| 898375 | | RESIDENT | LP2015761 | Proposed wildlife corridors are not based on sound evidence and are compromised by planned developments and new roads. They | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and | Comments noted. Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and map components of the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | do not meet NPPF requirements for establishing coherent ecological networks. | | Geodiversity | <p>local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. There is no definitive methodology for producing a Borough ecological network map. However we have drawn heavily on external resources, including National Planning Policy and Natural England's work. Alongside the Local Plan a number of additional evidence based studies and guides have been developed, including the North Tyneside Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). As part of this strategy North Tyneside's Wildlife corridors have been reviewed following significant changes in the landscape since the previous GI strategy and UDP. In order to produce North Tyneside's Wildlife Enhancement Corridors (WEC), for the emerging Local Plan it is essential that a baseline map with all existing green space was produced. This is in line with Natural England's recommendations for opportunity mapping and habitat networks. Working with organisations and individuals in particular with North Tyneside's Ecologist, existing designated sites and valuable habitats were first mapped on GIS. Clusters of habitats and sites which form the core wildlife areas for the Borough were then identified. This then led onto plotting network links between the core areas. Potential buffers, links and stepping stones</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | were created to produce large habitat areas, and to create a functional wildlife network. Outside the network, wildlife habitats and sites will continue to be managed and protected, and can be buffered by habitat creation and appropriate management. It is recognised that the additional development proposed in the Local Plan could have indirect impacts on biodiversity and the use of open space for recreation. Wildlife Corridor designation does not automatically render development obsolete. Local Planning Authorities are required by National Planning Policy to identify areas of habitat that connect wildlife. North Tyneside's Local Plan seeks to encourage development which helps to maintain and enhance these links. Wildlife corridors help to identify the importance of the area within the network. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4. | |
| 898404 | | RESIDENT | LP2015773 | I am writing to confirm my strong support for the disused railway known locally as the Benton Curve to stay as "wildlife corridor". I believe this is vitally important. I will very upset should I find that this is being changed. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898969 | | | LP2015995 | The map included in the plan shows the seafront through Whitley Bay as having a wildlife corridor designation. The promenade is just concrete, bricks and flagstones. No effort has been made to make this 'corridor' into a wildlife corridor by providing suitable native plants, trees and shrubs etc. The few plants that have been provided have been done in very small planters and generally contain non-native, invasive plants, which is hardly a | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. North Tyneside's coastline makes up a very important Wildlife Corridor. North Tyneside has two sites of special scientific interest (SSSI). Due to the importance of the coastline North Tyneside receives a large number of wintering birds including purple Sandpiper, Turnstone and Little Turn. Policy S8.4 (now S5.4) outlines that 'The Borough's biodiversity and geodiversity resources will be protected, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | endorsement for protecting and enhancing biodiversity. In addition, nesting sites of birds such a House Martin, Swift, Swallow, House Sparrow and Starling have been destroyed through the demolition of empty buildings with no attempt to replace these. How does the council propose to develop, enhance and maintain suitable wildlife corridors? | | | enhanced and managed having regard to their relative significance. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4. | |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151103 | Green Party The proposed development of the land at Murton and scale of land allocated does not seem to support the requirement to give priority achieving the objectives and targets set out in the Biodiversity Action Plan, in particular in relation to the identified target area Murton within the BAP for creation and enhancement of up to 5 linear kilometres of Scrub & Hedgerow, and up to 10ha of new native scrub/ shrub land. The proposed development plot infringes on an identified wildlife corridor which is designated as a priority transport route. 8 acres of the Murton plot is already set-aside to be retained as undeveloped grassland and wetland area under a planning obligation to provide offset habitat for a development elsewhere in the borough. Areas of this offset land are also infringed by the proposed development, particularly priority transport infrastructure. The plan does not identify or accept the existence of this land at all. It is imperative that the unavailability of this land is made clear in the development plan, and that any development proposal is considered in light of this land. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. The Local Planning Authority is aware of a number of constraints which exist within the site and does not expect the whole site to be developed. As outlined in AS7.4 (now S4.4, now split into 4.4a-c) the North Tyneside Council expect a Master plan for the strategic allocation sites in order to ensure the safeguarding of important green infrastructure assets. In line with this master planning a number of ecological surveys must be carried out before any development can be considered. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899469 | | | LP20151291 | The proposed development of the land at Murton and scale of land allocated does not seem to support the requirement to give | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and | Comments noted. The Local Planning Authority is aware of a number of constraints which exist within the site and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | priority achieving the objectives and targets set out in the Biodiversity Action Plan, in particular in relation to the identified target area Murton within the BAP for creation and enhancement of up to 5 linear kilometres of Scrub & Hedgerow, and up to 10ha of new native scrub/ shrub land. The proposed development plot infringes on an identified wildlife corridor which is designated as a priority transport route. 8 acres of the Murton plot is already set-aside to be retained as undeveloped grassland and wetland area under a planning obligation to provide offset habitat for a development elsewhere in the borough. Areas of this offset land are also infringed by the proposed development, particularly priority transport infrastructure. The plan does not identify or accept the existence of this land at all. It is imperative that the unavailability of this land is made clear in the development plan, and that any development proposal is considered in light of this land. | | Geodiversity | does not expect the whole site to be developed. As outlined in AS7.4 (now S4.4, now split into policy 4.4a-c)the North Tyneside Council expect a Master plan for the strategic allocation sites in order to ensure the safeguarding of important green infrastructure assets. In line with this master planning a number of ecological surveys must be carried out before any development can be considered. | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151357 | Policy DM8:4 Biodiversity and geodiversity. CPRE supports this policy. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 899669 | | RESIDENT | LP20151397 | I am just emailing you to let you know that I strongly support the designation of the Benton Curve as a wildlife corridor. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 805211 | | RESIDENT | LP20151434 | Proposed wildlife corridors are compromised by planned development and new roads and are not based on sound assessment. They do not meet NPPF requirements for establishing coherent ecological networks. Development sites are proposed which are inappropriate | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | and contrary to planning policy. For example Site 11 now Site E010 contains a Site of Local Wildlife Interest, site 109 is located on a wildlife corridor and part of sites 35-41 is to provide ecological compensation for a development elsewhere in the borough. | | | biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. There is no definitive methodology for producing a Borough ecological network map. However we have drawn heavily on external resources, including National Planning Policy and Natural England's work. Alongside the Local Plan a number of additional evidence based studies and guides have been developed, including the North Tyneside Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). As part of this strategy North Tyneside's Wildlife Corridors have been reviewed following significant changes in the landscape since the previous GI strategy and UDP. In order to produce North Tyneside's Wildlife Enhancement Corridors (WEC), for the emerging Local Plan it is essential that a baseline map with all existing green space was produced. This is in line with Natural England's recommendations for opportunity mapping and habitat networks. Working with organisations and individuals, in particular with North Tyneside's Ecologist, existing designated sites and valuable habitats were first mapped on GIS. Clusters of habitats and sites which form the core wildlife areas for the Borough were then identified. This then led onto plotting network links between the core areas. Potential buffers, links and stepping stones were created to produce large habitat areas, and to create a functional wildlife network. Outside the network, wildlife habitats and | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>sites will continue to be managed and protected, and can be buffered by habitat creation and appropriate management. It is recognised that the additional development proposed in the Local Plan could have indirect impacts on biodiversity and the use of open space for recreation. In preparing site allocations, North Tyneside Council has considered the potential impact of each site allocation on biodiversity and green spaces assets. Where new development occurs North Tyneside Council will seek on or off-site provision resulting from recreational pressure on existing Green Infrastructure sites, when practical. As part of the review of the Local Plan and comments received, a new policy is proposed allowing for a Open Break south of West Moor. This policy would cover the proposed safeguarded land to the south of West Moor and a northern section of Site 11 now Site E010 (NT031) covering the Site of Local Conservation Importance (SLCI). The justification of such a policy would be to reflect the significance of the open space to the character of West Moor and protection of biodiversity value. The site is in close proximity to the Gosforth Park SSSI, includes the SLCI and responds to the advice from the Councils biodiversity officer who recommended 'The SLCI should remain undeveloped and adequately buffered by any potential future development'. Although some designated sites have wildlife corridors running through them there is no reason to consider why these sites could not accommodate future</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | development whilst adhering to the policies and maintaining a linked workable network of wildlife corridors. The Local Planning Authority is aware of a number of constraints which exist within the site and does not expect the whole site to be developed. As outlined in AS7.4 (now S4.4) the North Tyneside Council expect a Master plan for the strategic allocation sites in order to ensure the safeguarding of important green infrastructure assets. In line with this master planning a number of ecological surveys must be carried out before any development can be considered. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4. | |
| 805535 | | | LP20151564 | Thus avoiding the use of the powerlines as a wildlife corridor- Running from the Seaton Burn waggon way wildlife corridor along the side of the B1317 road to the old R.E.M.E. site which has planning permission for Bellway housing. This would stop the merging of communities and retain a measure of green open space on the upper East side of Killingworth Moor, and fulfil objectives of AS7.4 (d.& e.) Also S8.4, (c, d,) +8.20. - e.g.- " Green infrastructure corridors must be safeguarded through S.S. Allocations. Major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identity, maintaining amenity space and access to the countryside and biodiversity".. This would stop the urban sprawl of the Killingworth estate joining in with the new proposed | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. The wildlife Corridors on the consultation map are indicative. The Wildlife corridor running along the pylons at Killingworth have been retained however amendments to the other corridors running through the site. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4. | Amendments to Killingworth Wildlife Corridors |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>housing estate. "Wildlife corridors allow movement of wildlife between areas of habitat, linking sites and reducing the risk of isolated populations becoming unstable and dying out. Therefore it is important the network of wildlife sites and links between them is maintained and enhanced ". there is evidence to prove that electricity pylon routes are of no use as wildlife corridors. Study suggests pylons and wires that stretch across many landscapes are having a worldwide impact on wildlife! Power lines are seen as glowing and flashing bands across the sky by many animals, research has revealed. Scientists knew many creatures avoid power lines but the reason why was mysterious as they are not impassable physical barriers. Now, a new understanding of just how many species can see the ultraviolet light "" which is invisible to humans "" has revealed the major visual impact of the power lines."It was a big surprise but we now think the majority of animals can see UV light," said Professor Glen Jeffery, a vision expert at University College London. "There is no reason why this phenomenon is not occurring around the world."Dr Nicolas Tyler, an ecologist at UIT The Arctic University of Norway and another member of the research team, said: "The flashes occur at random in time and space, so the power lines are not grey and passive, but seen as lines of light flashing."He said the discovery has global significance: "The loss and fragmentation of habitat by infrastructure is the principle global threat to biodiversity "" it is absolutely major. Roads have always got</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>particular attention but this will push power lines right up the list of offenders." The avoidance of power lines can interfere with migration routes, breeding grounds and grazing for both animals and birds. Autopsies on dozens of mammals from zoos and abattoirs showed their eyes were able to see UV, including cattle, cats, dogs, rats, bats, okapi, red pandas and hedgehogs. Also on the list were reindeer and further work published in the journal Conservation Biology showed these animals, whose eyes are specially adapted to the dark Arctic winters, are particularly sensitive to UV light. UV vision helps reindeer find plants in snow cover, but in the depths of winter their wide irises and sensitive eyes means the power lines appear particularly bright. The avoidance of power lines had been explained in the past by the corridors cut through forests to accommodate them, where animals would be exposed in the open to predators. Around the world, Tyler said: "There are hundred of examples of animals avoiding power lines. Now we know that, not only do these clear-cut corridors mean exposure to predators, at the same time there is this damn thing flashing at you."Jeffery said burying all power cables would be unrealistically expensive but added that one idea would be to put a non-conducting shield around the cable to screen it from view. The UV light, which is caused by electricity ionising the air around cables, are a major source of inefficiency for electricity companies and also cause the hissing or crackling noises sometimes heard. Power</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | companies already use helicopter-mounted UV cameras to monitor power cables, because the flashes can be an early sign of conduction problems, but the cameras only record a very narrow range of UV. "Animals see across the range, so the intensity of light seen by them is much more than seen by the helicopter flights," said Jeffery. The new research was funded by the UK's Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council. There is also the issue of the many research papers on powerlines & childhood leukaemia-this is why you have designated the route under the powerlines as the wildlife corridor, because you cannot build houses in close proximity to the power lines. | | | | |
| 899297 | | | LP20151701 | Biodiversity and Geodiversity . Paragraph 8.18 I welcome the recognition that those ecological features outside of designated sites provide important and invaluable contributions to local biodiversity.. . Policy S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity. . Objection . NPPF requires LPAs in paragraph 114 to set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity. . I welcome the inclusion of point d, however would like to see more references to creation of wildlife corridors and biodiversity resources particularly in the opening sentence of this policy. . I have concerns that other policies and allocations in this document have conflicting aims with the Policy S/8.4, thus making such actions as protecting and | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. The term 'creation' has been added into the opening sentence of policy S5.4 (was S8.4). | Policy S5.4 amended 'The Borough's biodiversity and geodiversity resources will be protected, <u>created</u> , enhanced and managed having regard to their relative significance. Priority will be given to:' |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | enhancing wildlife links unlikely to be achievable. | | | | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151901 | Objection NHSN has concerns that other policies and allocations in this document have conflicting aims with the Policy S/8.4, thus making such actions as protecting and enhancing wildlife links unlikely to be achievable. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. The Local Plan must be read as a whole. Although some designated sites have wildlife corridors running through them there is no reason to consider why these sites could not accommodate future development whilst adhering to the policies and maintaining a linked workable network of wildlife corridors. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151905 | Furthermore, we do not consider the wildlife corridor allocations to be either functional or accurate to what is on the ground. These appear to be very loose links between small areas of green land (a lot of which is either currently allocated for development or is allocated in this new Local Plan) that do not form any coherent tangible wildlife link across the borough. For these wildlife corridors to have any functionality or be defensible in a planning inquiry they should be realistic and enforceable. Therefore at present the wildlife corridors do not meet NPPF requirement (paragraph 109) to establish "coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures" . The LPA should plan positively for biodiversity and produce a targeted, strategic plan for areas that would be suitable for off-site mitigation. This plan should produce a series of linked areas that would be suitable and produce a net gain for biodiversity across the borough to meet the requirements of NPPF. Again we make reference to paragraph 114 of NPPF that requires LPAs to "set out a strategic | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. There is no definitive methodology for producing a Borough wildlife network map. However we have drawn heavily on external resources, including National Planning Policy and Natural England's work. The LPA have been working closely with NHSN and NWT to work through any issues raised with regards to the Wildlife Corridors. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure" . The mapping of areas for habitat creation and retention (by a local partnership) is required by NPPF paragraph 117. This has not happened. | | | | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151948 | This policy prioritises the protection of statutory and non-statutory designated sites, BAP habitats, and the wider ecological network. Natural England support this overarching strategic policy. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 805556 | | | LP20151975 | Also S8.4, (c, d,) +8.20. - e.g.- " Green infrastructure corridors must be safeguarded through S.S. Allocations. Major new areas of open space and country park provision should be located to avoid the joining together of settlements and maintain their unique character and identity, maintaining amenity space and access to the countryside and biodiversity".. "Wildlife corridors allow movement of wildlife between areas of habitat, linking sites and reducing the risk of isolated populations becoming unstable and dying out. Therefore it is important the network of wildlife sites and links between them is maintained and enhanced ". Please note I believe there is evidence that electricity pylon routes are of no use as wildlife corridors. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. North Tyneside does have a lot of Wildlife located near electricity pylons however it is acknowledged that some wildlife would avoid the areas. Whilst the Wildlife Corridors running along the pylon lines within Killingworth have been maintained, additional wildlife corridors have been amended. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4. | Map amendments actioned |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152011 | The consortium supports the provision of a wildlife corridor within the Killingworth Moor site. However we believe the route of the corridor should follow the Forest Hall Letch. There is potential for a corridor to sit | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Amendments made to the Wildlife Corridor to cover the Forest Hall Letch. It must be noted that wildlife corridors are indicative and will be worked out through the masterplanning stage. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | alongside development with recreational uses as well to achieve a very high level of environmental, social and economic sustainability. This will be demonstrated with the Council through the masterplanning exercise for the site. | | | Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | |
| 808201 | | RESIDENT | LP20152111 | Wildlife corridors which were submitted in the 1980's have been blocked either by housing or industry. There is no wildlife corridor marked on the 'brown site' near Gosforth Woods. Can this be amended to include a corridor? | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | The White-House Farm site with planning permission does incorporate Wildlife Corridors which are shown indicatively on the Local Plan Map. A more detail Wildlife Corridor Map is provided in the Green Infrastructure Strategy 2015. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 901338 | | RESIDENT | LP20152225 | With regard to the new North Tyneside Council Plan, I wish to express that I strongly support the plans to designate the "Benton Curve" (disused railway) as a Wildlife Corridor. | | S 8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S5.4 | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015507 | NPPF requires LPAs in paragraph 114 to set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity. Points a and b do not refer to either creation or management of the natural environment and therefore do not meet this requirement of NPPF. Point a does not meet the requirement for enhancement of biodiversity networks, nor to protect it is only to seek to minimise fragmentation. Whilst point b is acceptable, point a, at best, seeks only to maintain the status quo, we would not consider this planning positively for biodiversity. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek that point is reworded to exclude "where appropriate" and to replace with "unless otherwise shown to be | | DM 8.5 Managing effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Policy DM8.5 point (d) has been amended to reflect comments. The policies within the Local Plan should be read as a whole. Cross referencing is therefore not deemed appropriate in this instance. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.5 | Amendments actioned. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|----------------------|
| | | | | <p>inappropriate" . This is a much more positive way to seek biodiversity and geodiversity features within development proposals. We welcome the change to this part of the policy. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek a re-wording of point"d" to read The benefits of the development clearly demonstrably outweigh any direct or indirect adverse impacts on the features of the site and the wider wildlife links€ . Any Policy (and the results it brings) should be defensible in a planning inquiry. It is far clearer to ask a developer to demonstrate that a development outweighs adverse impacts rather than just stating that those impacts should clearly outweigh adverse impacts. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek a cross reference between policies S/8.4 and DM/8.5 in point "€™ so that developments make positive contributions to the aims of S/8.4. In reference to point "€™ the Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek that appropriate surveys are carried out to industry guidelines. We welcome the change to this part of the policy. Paragraph 8.20 NPPF also requires LPAs to provide net biodiversity gains where possible. This should be reflected in the Local Plan document. This appears to have changed to paragraph 8.10?</p> | | | | |
| 396412 | Northumb erland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATI ON | LP2015620 | <p>In order to overcome the deficiency in household access to semi-natural green space the above policies should seek to create biodiversity areas, as per NPPF requirements. The policies as they stand cannot deliver this.</p> | | DM 8.5 Managing effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity | <p>Comments noted. DM8.5 (d) reads "All development proposals should maximise opportunities for <u>creation</u>, restoration, enhancement, management and connection of natural habitats". The Local Plan and relevant supporting evidence documents supports the creation of biodiversity areas.</p> | Amendments actioned. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.5. | |
| 898969 | | | LP2015997 | What is the council proposing to do to address the issue of non-native, invasive species such as Japanese knotweed, which is currently affecting the St Mary's Island nature reserve? Has the Council seriously considered the effects of the proposed visitor centre etc. on the existing wetland at SMI inc. its wildlife? | | DM 8.5 Managing effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity | As outlined by national planning policy, Local Planning Authorities must plan positively. Throughout North Tyneside's Local Plan it is outlined how we will seek to manage, protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity which will include the management of non-native species. The spread of Japanese Knotweed is controlled by law. The council also have a separate Japanese Knotweed control programme. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.5 | No amendments proposed. |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151104 | Green Party The 2010 Biodiversity Action Plan identifies the Murton development site as land of high biodiversity potential, and establishes targets for additional biodiversity creation and enhancement (in relation to hedgerows, scrub and shrub land). This plan is inconsistent with this policy requirement to only permit developments affecting priority habitats (as identified in the BAP) unless the benefits of development outweigh direct and indirect impacts on the site and wider ecological network. This development would lead to increased fragmentation of the habitat (in conjunction with the former impacts of the movement of protected species from Station Road East site to the new offset land at the site) and to the identified wildlife corridors passing through the site. | | DM 8.5 Managing effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. The Golden Plover mitigation site is not a designated wildlife site. It is proposed that the area of mitigation land is relocated to a similar suitable site in order to allow the effective delivery of housing policies within the Local Plan. Work for this is currently ongoing and will be resolved through the masterplanning process. Development will not take place without this issue being appropriately resolved. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.5 | No amendments proposed. |
| 899469 | | | LP20151292 | The 2010 Biodiversity Action Plan identifies the Murton development site as land of high biodiversity potential, and establishes targets for additional biodiversity creation and | | DM 8.5 Managing effects on Biodiversity | Comments noted. The Golden Plover mitigation site is not a designated wildlife site. It is proposed that the area of mitigation land is relocated to a similar | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | enhancement (in relation to hedgerows, scrub and shrub land). This plan is inconsistent with this policy requirement to only permit developments affecting priority habitats (as identified in the BAP) unless the benefits of development outweigh direct and indirect impacts on the site and wider ecological network. This development would lead to increased fragmentation of the habitat (in conjunction with the former impacts of the movement of protected species from Station Road East site to the new offset land at the site) and to the identified wildlife corridors passing through the site. | | and Geodiversity | suitable site in order to allow the effective delivery of housing policies within the Local Plan. Work for this is currently ongoing and will be resolved through the masterplanning process. Development will not take place without this issue being appropriately resolved. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.5 | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151358 | Policy DM8:5 Managing effects on biodiversity and geodiversity. Clarification of who will be responsible for assessing relative benefits in clause d), and what criteria would be used to compare e.g. badger population vs. jobs potential from a new business park. | | DM 8.5 Managing effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Applications for development will be assessed through formal planning procedures. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.5 | No amendments proposed. |
| 899297 | | | LP20151702 | Objection NPPF requires LPAs in paragraph 114 to set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity. Points "a and b' do not refer to either creation or management of the natural environment and therefore do not meet this requirement of NPPF. Point "a' does not meet the requirement for enhancement of biodiversity networks, nor to protect it is only to seek to minimise fragmentation. Whilst point b is acceptable, point a, at best, seeks only to maintain the status quo, I do not consider this planning positively for biodiversity. I would request a re-wording of | | DM 8.5 Managing effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Point policy DM8.5 (d) will be amended to reflect request. It is considered that the Local Plan is in line with NPPF requirements. The GI policies discuss the need to protect, manage, create and enhance North Tyneside's assets. A further policy has been added to provide further detail on the required approach to North Tyneside's Wildlife Corridors. This policy also aims to protect and enhance North Tyneside's Wildlife Corridors. In addition, the Green Space Provision and Standards policy expects that levels of access to semi-natural green space are maintained or improved as part of new development. The above policies work together to ensure the | Point d has been amended to reflect request. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | point '~d' to read "The benefits of the development clearly demonstrably outweigh any direct or indirect adverse impacts on the features of the site and the wider wildlife links" . Any Policy (and the results it brings) should be defensible in a planning inquiry. It is far clearer to ask a developer to demonstrate that a development outweighs adverse impacts rather than just stating that those impacts should clearly outweigh adverse impacts. Paragraph 8.20 NPPF also requires LPAs to provide net biodiversity gains where possible. This should be reflected in the Local Plan document. Paragraph 8.23. In order to overcome the deficiency in household access to semi-natural green space the above policies should seek to create biodiversity areas, as per NPPF requirements. The policies as they stand cannot deliver this. | | | creation and improvement of biodiversity as part of new development. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.5 | |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151902 | Objection NPPF requires LPAs in paragraph 114 to set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity. Point a, at best, seeks only to maintain the status quo, we would not consider this planning positively for biodiversity. | | DM 8.5 Managing effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Policy DM8.5 should be read as a whole. Point a) seeks to protect the biodiversity and geodiversity. Point b) states that all development proposals should ' <u>maximise</u> opportunities for <u>creation</u> , <u>restoration</u> , <u>enhancement</u> , management and connection of natural habitats and c) incorporate beneficial biodiversity and geodiversity conservation features providing <u>net gains</u> to biodiversity, unless otherwise shown to be inappropriate'. It is therefore considered that the policy meets the requirements outline in the NPPF. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.5 | No amendments proposed. |
| 638268 | Natural History | | LP20151904 | NHSN has serious concerns over the allocation of land for new housing on land | | DM 8.5 Managing | Comments noted. The Golden Plover mitigation site is not a designated wildlife | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | Society of Northumbria | | | that has already been targeted for off-site mitigation for existing developments such as Station Road mitigation land at Murton. Mitigation and compensatory land for biodiversity should not be developed. This will not contribute towards biodiversity net gain, nor does it plan positively for the "protection... of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure" (paragraph 114 of NNPF). We would seek that the LPA includes a policy that states that land used for mitigation for losses and adverse impacts on biodiversity should remain un-developed in perpetuity. | | effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity | site. It is proposed that the area of mitigation land is relocated to a similar suitable site in order to allow the effective delivery of housing policies within the Local Plan. Work for this is currently ongoing and will be resolved through the masterplanning process. Development will not take place without this issue being appropriately resolved. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.5 | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151949 | The criteria applied to developments that affect nationally and locally designated sites should reflect the approach to their protection as set out in paragraph 118 of the NPPF. 26. Policy DM8.5 should be amended as follows considering this, with additional amendments suggested for clarity: "All development proposals should: a. protect the biodiversity and geodiversity value of land, protected species and buildings and minimise fragmentation of habitats; d. The benefits of the development in that location clearly outweigh any direct or indirect impacts on the interest features of the site and/or the wider ecological network. f. For all adverse impacts of the development appropriate mitigation measures, reinstatement of features, or, as a last resort, compensation to enhance or create habitats form part of the proposals on or off site." | | DM 8.5 Managing effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity | Comments noted. Amendments made to DM8.5. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.5 | Amendments actioned. |
| 463028 | | | LP2015263 | The section about conserving enhancing and managing wildlife corridors is at odds with North Tyneside's suggested sites for | | DM 8.6 Management of | The wildlife corridor map in the Local Plan outlines the general direction of the corridors. A more specific Wildlife Corridor | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | development. The map shows wildlife corridors going through three areas that either have planning permission for houses, or are marked for development: - Site 17 (Station Road West) - The site opposite this i.e. East of Station Road and West of the Rising Sun, where building has already started. - Holystone (despite a 3500 signature petition), between the bypass and the A19, next to the Stonebrook pub and hotel. This makes no sense at all, as the development will block the wildlife corridor. Is the wildlife supposed to go through peoples' gardens? North Tyneside need to rethink this and stop development in this area. | | International Sites | Map is provided within North Tyneside's Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015). This map shows the exact location of the Wildlife Corridors. Master plans of proposed housing developments have been assessed during the review of the Wildlife Corridors to ensure that they cover key areas. Private gardens are a very important wildlife asset and help connect various networks. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.6 | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151359 | Policy DM8:6. CPRE supports this policy. | | DM 8.6 Management of International Sites | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.6 | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151950 | Natural England supports the introduction of this policy which seeks to ensure that the local plan is compliant with the Habitats Regulations. However use of the measure "Preparation and implementation of a Habitat Creation Plan" should only be considered as a compensatory measure if: adverse effects cannot be ruled out; avoidance and mitigation measures have been deemed to be unworkable; there is no alternative and the development meets the test of imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI). The inclusion of compensatory measures to address adverse effects on European/international sites prejudices these strict tests and would not comply with the | | DM 8.6 Management of International Sites | Comment noted. This will be removed from the list of criteria. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.6 | "Preparation and implementation of a Habitat Creation Plan" removed from the policy. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | Habitats Directive as it accepts adverse effects may not be avoided. | | | | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151968 | North Tyneside Council Local Plan: Consultation 2015 Sustainability Appraisal Report - Sites that have been identified in the SA as having environmental impacts and which have been listed in the local plan as suitable locations for development should only be selected after investigation of alternative sites with less harmful impacts to reflect the approach to their protection as set out in paragraph 118 of the NPPF. In particular, housing sites with the potential to negatively affect Northumbria Coast SSSI should ideally be replaced by less sensitive sites to reduce the likelihood of direct impact or indirect impact (such as through recreational disturbance). | | DM 8.6 Management of International Sites | The Local Plan process has to identify sufficient deliverable housing land to meet the objectively assessed needs of the Borough. Some of these sites may be in locations that could negatively affect internationally, nationally and locally designated wildlife sites. The HRA/AA that has been prepared to accompany the Local Plan sets out provisions to follow that would allow for the avoidance of negative affects. Similarly, the Local Plan contains policies to protect biodiversity ,which will be implemented when making decisions on development. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.6 | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151969 | Habitats Regulations Assessment The following advice on the HRA should be read alongside Natural England's advice on the relevant above policies. Natural England agree with list of policies and sites that are screened in to be taken to the AA stage, however as previously stated the following policies should also be taken through to the AA stage: AS1.5 The Coastal Sub Area, S5.1 Economic Growth Strategy, S6.1 Competitive Centres and DM7.5 Criteria for New Housing Development. Additionally the potential housing development sites should be reassessed both individually and cumulatively to take into consideration the effects of recreational disturbance both alone and in combination. When assessing recreational disturbance you could, if available, use visitor data that details | | DM 8.6 Management of International Sites | The Council's HRA has been revised to take into full consideration the comments highlighted and has incorporated additional engagement and recommended mitigations from Natural England. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>where significant numbers of people come from when using Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar to influence your decision of which allocations should be considered in combination. You should be confident that the inclusion and content of policy DM8.6 Management of International Sites is enough to determine no adverse effect on integrity for the entire local plan. It should be clearly explained within the HRA how the mitigation measures within the policy will be delivered and ensure, in the conclusion of the HRA, that they will be effective at preventing adverse effects on integrity (in respect of the conservation objectives) alone and in combination. Given that detailed visitor and tourism proposals haven't been identified in the plan there is uncertainty regarding effects upon the SPA/Ramsar. Therefore, in this case, detailed mitigation can be deferred to the project stage. However given the reliance on policy DM8.6 to mitigate adverse effects and its potential to effect project viability, examples of mitigation and delivery mechanisms should support the HRA. The structure of the HRA requires amending to ensure that in combination effects with other plans and projects are appropriately assessed. The 2015 assesses both effects alone and in combination before determining mitigation measures. If, having ruled out adverse effects of the plan alone, the penultimate stage the HRA (before the conclusion and next step) should re-assess whether there would be residual effects that may adversely affect the site in combination. If your authority feel it</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | necessary, Natural England would be willing to discuss our advice on the HRA. | | | | |
| 396412 | Northumb erland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATI ON | LP2015537 | In order to achieve the aims of the Local Biodiversity Action Plan the Northumberland Wildlife Trust would encourage that a preference towards native species of local provenance is included within this policy. NWT welcomes the inclusion of native trees in this revised policy. However, in point c the use of "where appropriate" is not needed and only leads to ambiguity in the policy. | | DM 8.7 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Comment noted and amendments actioned. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.7 | Point c amended to reflect request. |
| 805689 | | | LP2015894 | "Protect and manage existing woodland, trees, hedgerows and landscape features "Removing the litter should take priority. Look after and improve what we already have before planning new schemes. | | DM 8.7 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Comments noted. The Planning system primarily deals with the built environment. The Local Plan contains a policy to ensure that new developments Provide sustainable waste management (during construction and use) through the provision of recycling facilities and ensure a suitable location for the storage and collection of waste (policy 7.9 New Development and Waste). | No amendments proposed. |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151105 | Green Party We need some detail here "" where are these trees, when will they be replaced etc. The following policy about tree planting seems to prioritise trees in the new housing and other building developments rather than protecting and enhancing those on green field land or other parts of the borough. | | DM 8.7 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Comment noted. The purpose of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2015) is to 'set out the preferred policies and proposals that the Council proposes to guide planning decisions and establish the framework for the sustainable growth and development of North Tyneside up to 2032'. The plan details the policies for the management and enhancement of existing trees whilst also outlining our requirements for new developments. For instance Policy DM 8.7 (now Policy DM5.9) states 'a) Protect and manage existing woodland, trees, hedgerows and landscape features' and b) 'Where appropriate, secure the implementation of new tree planting and | No amendments proposed. Policy DM8.7 is now under reference DM5.9. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | landscaping schemes as a condition of planning permission for new development'. Tree planting schemes and new developments will be dealt with on a case by case basis which must adhere to adopted planning policy. | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151360 | Policy DM8:7. Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows. CPRE welcomes this policy, particularly with the implicit prioritisation of retaining existing woodland and hedgerows over replacement. | | DM 8.7 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.9. | No amendments proposed. Policy DM8.7 is now under reference DM5.9. |
| 899297 | | | LP20151703 | I welcome the inclusion of native trees in this revised policy. However, in point c the use of "where appropriate€ is not needed and only leads to ambiguity in the policy. | | DM 8.7 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Comments noted and amendments made as requested. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.9 | Amendments actioned. Policy DM8.7 is now under reference DM5.9. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151951 | Natural England supports this policy. | | DM 8.7 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Support noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.9. | No amendments proposed. Policy DM8.7 is now under reference DM5.9. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152046 | Policy DM 8.7 sets the authorities plans for tree and woodland protection which in general terms are supported and endorsed. We have specific concerns with the requirement of a minimum ten year ongoing management of planting schemes for new developments. This is extremely onerous and completely unprecedented and un-evidenced. A usual management arrangement would be along the lines of a 5 year post planting which includes the re planting or replacement of lost species. We would significantly question if this has been robustly tested via a viability assessment or in fact any of these policies within this plan have as no viability assessment has been provided. | | DM 8.7 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows | Comments noted. The importance of appropriate long-term maintenance cannot be underestimated if planting is established and fulfil its potential. Policy amended to read "Planting schemes included with new development must be accompanied by an appropriate Management Plan agreed with the Local Planning Authority". Please note this policy number has now changed to DM5.9. | Amendments actioned. |
| 805252 | | RESIDENT | LP201546 | But recent work to improve Wallsend park is also appreciated. I think this will be kept going | | AS 8.8 Key Green spaces | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | due to volunteers. Please help areas like this rather than pouring money into Whitley Bay. | | in Wallsend and Willington Quay | | |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015538 | Whilst the Northumberland Wildlife Trust is encouraged by this policy, it is noted that "improvements to the area for wildlife and recreation€ is in conflict with the land allocations for development, namely Site 9, now Site E008, 9. Should the allocation for Site 9, now Site E008, 9 go ahead, the Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek that the area developed be significantly reduced from that which is currently allocated. This statement remains current. | | AS 8.8 Key Green spaces in Wallsend and Willington Quay | Comments noted. It is intended that the site would not be completely developed, with retention of open space seen to be important in this location. There are a number of constraints on this (and other) allocations which would need to be respected in future planning applications | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151361 | Policy AS8:8 CPRE broadly supports this policy. The balance between managing flood risk, moderating water hazards and encouraging wildlife is difficult. We trust that this policy of de-culverting will strike the right balance. | | AS 8.8 Key Green spaces in Wallsend and Willington Quay | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 638268 | Natural History Society of Northumbria | | LP20151903 | We welcome the inclusion of native trees in this revised policy. However, in point c the use of "where appropriate" weakens the policy. Wording ought to emphasise that native species should be used unless it can be shown that native species would not be appropriate. | | AS 8.8 Key Green spaces in Wallsend and Willington Quay | Comment noted. Amendments made. | Amendments made. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151952 | Natural England supports this policy. | | AS 8.8 Key Green spaces in Wallsend and Willington Quay | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015539 | Referring back to the Northumberland Wildlife Trust's comments re: Policy DM/8.8 Trees and Woodland, the Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek that the | | AS 8.9 Movement and Green Links in | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|------------------------------|
| | | | | introduction of trees and other appropriate planting be specified as native species of local provenance. The inclusion of the reference to native trees in this revised policy is welcomed by NWT. | | Wallsend and Willington Quay | | |
| 396449 | Cyclists Touring Club | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015584 | g. Change Hadrian Cycleway "Route 72" to National Cycle Network Route 72, Hadrian's Cycleway (or NCN 72, Hadrian's Cycleway) - | | AS 8.9 Movement and Green Links in Wallsend and Willington Quay | Comment noted. | Amendment made as suggested. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151362 | Policy AS8:9: CPRE welcomes this policy | | AS 8.9 Movement and Green Links in Wallsend and Willington Quay | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899297 | | | LP20151704 | Whilst being encouraged by this policy, it is noted that "improvements to the area for wildlife and recreation" is in conflict with the land allocations for development, namely Site 9, now Site E008, 9. Should the allocation for Site 9, now Site E008, 9 go ahead, the area developed should be significantly reduced from that which is currently allocated. | | AS 8.9 Movement and Green Links in Wallsend and Willington Quay | Comments noted. It is intended that the site would not be completely developed, with retention of open space seen to be important in this location. There are a number of constraints on this (and other) allocations which would need to be respected in future planning applications | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151953 | Natural England supports this policy. | | AS 8.9 Movement and Green Links in Wallsend and Willington Quay | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 805689 | | | LP2015898 | Having grown up on North Tyneside, I remember the good old days with the Spanish | | Enhancing the Built | Comments noted. Regeneration work is ongoing at the Spanish City site. The Council | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | | City funfair and think fondly of it when I drive through the centre of where it once stood. I understand why the decision was taken to close it down and I also accept that change generally is inevitable and necessary. However, when trying to win people over to unpopular decisions, it would appear to me that a few simple actions - such as painting the dome (and yes there is white paint that dispels dirt - I saw it on Grand Designs) and keeping the area litter-free, might help people see change in a more positive light. | | Environment | have a Streetcare team who deal with litter issues and they are aware of your concerns. Residents are encouraged to report issues by calling the team or via an online form: http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/403/report-untidy-streets-and-overflowing-litter-bins | |
| 797386 | | | LP20151080 | The owners of residential and commercial Listed buildings in the area spend a great deal of money on preserving them - in part, this is for private benefit but it is also for the public good. Those owners need financial help in doing this - the Council needs to continue to support by applying for Heritage Lottery funding and other central funding but some local funds are needed in addition. And the planners need to appreciate that the preservation of these buildings will only be possible if some planning rules are interpreted with some flexibility. | | Heritage Assets | Comments noted. Heritage Lottery Funding, etc. generally require some match funding from the Local Authority and North Tyneside Council have offered and continue to offer that support to a number of schemes. Planning decisions are made in balancing a number of considerations; however, as set out in the NPPF, significant weight is attached to the protection of listed buildings and their loss or damage should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152115 | Para 9.43. This section is welcomed although it could be better worded. For instance: "this includes its Roman significance with the presence of Hadrian's Wall...and its early medieval and medieval origins" would be better written: "Heritage assets include Hadrian's Wall..., early medieval and medieval remains..." | | Heritage Assets | Comments noted. Section will be rewritten. | Para 9.43 (now para 9.13) now reads "North Tyneside is rich and diverse in architectural and historic interest. This is reflected in the number of heritage assets within the Borough, both designated and non-designated. The Borough contains a great deal of reminders of its unique |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | past, including Roman, medieval, Victorian and late 20th Century heritage assets.". Information about Hadrian's Wall moved to para 9.45. |
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152118 | Para 9.44 I am pleased that the Historic Environment Record is mentioned here. | | Heritage Assets | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152122 | 9.58 second sentence should say "Historic England guidance" not "English Heritage policy". | | Heritage Assets | Comment noted. | Para 9.59 (now para 9.29) now reads "regard to the Historic England guidance for Enabling Development." |
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152124 | 9.59 I am pleased that there is a separate archaeology section. Instead of using "sites of archaeological importance" please use "archaeological sites which are designated heritage assets". Please add that Hadrian's Wall is a World Heritage Site. Instead of using "many other sites of archaeological interest" please use "archaeological sites which are non-designated heritage assets". Including prehistoric, Roman and early medieval (Anglo Saxon) sites, the sites old medieval villages". Whilst I do endeavour to keep the HER up-to-date, it is probably not entirely accurate to say that all known archaeological remains are included. There may be omissions. I would just say "the archaeological remains of North Tyneside are recorded on the Tyne and Wear Historic Environment Record". | | Heritage Assets | Comments noted. Section will be rewritten. | Para 9.60 (now para 9.30) now reads "Within the Borough there are a number of sites of archaeological importance that are designated heritage assets and are subject to statutory control and protection. This includes eight scheduled ancient monuments; two of which are part of the Hadrian's Wall WHS. There are also many other sites of archaeological interest that are non-designated heritage assets, including sites where Anglo-Saxon, Roman and earlier finds have been made, the sites of old villages, medieval |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | field systems and early industrial sites including many associated with the coal industry. The archaeological remains of North Tyneside are recorded on the Tyne and Wear Historic Environment Record." |
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152127 | 9.60 Should this say National Planning Policy Framework as well as National Planning Practice Guidance? | | Heritage Assets | Comment noted. | "NPPF" added to 9.61. |
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152129 | 9.61 Please add at the end "and the level of archaeological work which is required". | | Heritage Assets | Comment noted. | Sentence added to the end of para 9.62. |
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152131 | 9.62 I am pleased to see this section about publication. | | Heritage Assets | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152136 | On the policies map I still think it is difficult to differentiate between Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Conservation Areas. Can a block colour not be used for the SAMs? Again, perhaps the World Heritage Site buffer zone should be shown on this map. | | Heritage Assets | Comments noted. Issues will be addressed on new version of Policies Map. | Changes made to Policies Map as requested. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152120 | Evidence and an understanding of significance and possible harm in relation to public benefit To be found sound the Plan should be based on adequate up-to-date evidence about the historic environment, used to assess the significance of heritage assets (designated and non-designated) and the contribution they make to the local area (NPPF paragraphs I 58 and I 69). In order that the historic | | Heritage Assets | The Heritage Assessment sets out the consideration given to the impact on heritage assets that development at sites could have. Alongside the implantation of the archaeology policy, which requires archaeological assessment, preservation and possibly excavation prior to development taking place, it is considered that all sites are developable, subject to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>environment is appropriately safeguarded, it is necessary for the local planning authority to understand fully the significance of any heritage asset that may be affected (directly or otherwise), particularly by a site allocation, and to carefully assess the extent of any harm to, or loss of, its significance in relation to any public benefits that the development might bring. This understanding necessarily forms an integral part of the evidence base for the Plan. Following our helpful discussions last year, it is apparent that the Council has done much to respond to our initial concerns regarding the identification of potential site allocations and their effects upon the historic environment. It should be congratulated for producing the Local Plan Site Heritage Assessments document accompanying the Plan - a detailed and thorough piece of work. A reading of it, however, suggests that, at least in some cases, uncertainty remains as regards an understanding of the likely impacts of development on heritage in the area and the weight to be attached to the conservation of those assets. The importance of this lies in the fact that any uncertainty regarding the significance of any heritage assets likely to be affected by a site allocation, and any uncertainty regarding the level of harm, or loss, to them when weighed against public benefit that cannot be met in any other way casts doubts on the allocation being justified, deliverable and, ultimately, sustainable. English Heritage is not yet fully satisfied that the local planning authority is able to properly assert that the objectively assessed</p> | | | <p>certain design and layout approaches.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | | development needs of the area will be met in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF paragraph 14) as it relates to the historic environment, and is not yet satisfied that, in respect of its site allocations, the Plan is consistent with national policy. I hope that these comments and observations clarify the English Heritage position for you, and that the additional representations provided in ANNEX A are of some assistance in helping you to refine and develop the content of the Plan. Should you wish to discuss any of the matters raised I shall be happy, as always, to assist. | | | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152174 | The section entitled 'Heritage Assets' should read 'The Historic Environment and Heritage Assets'. | | Heritage Assets | Comment noted, this will be amended. | Title changed as suggested. |
| 901309 | Council for British Archaeology North | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152207 | North Tyneside has an excellent track record in promoting heritage best demonstrated by the ongoing investigations at sites including the Wallsend Roman Fort and Baths but also including more recent works on the restoration of Northumberland Park and the restoration of the Clifford's Fort. | | Heritage Assets | Comments noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 901309 | Council for British Archaeology North | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152215 | We are pleased to see that North Tyneside has a Local List and is using it in your Heritage Assessments of Proposed Sites. This is an approach we would encourage as best practice in any local authority area not just North Tyneside | | Heritage Assets | Comments noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 901309 | Council for British Archaeology North | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152217 | CBA North welcome the officer group study of these potential sites, but also notes that no specific archaeological advice was included within that process. We are particularly concerned that "When undertaking the heritage assessments, officers referred to GIS | | Heritage Assets | Comments noted. The HER and the input of the County Archaeologist was used when preparing the heritage assessments. This should have been noted in the Heritage Assessment document. This will be rectified. | Heritage Assessment now reads "When undertaking the heritage assessments, officers referred to the Tyne and Wear Historic Environment Record, the |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | | | sources, historic Ordnance Survey Maps, planning application histories, Google Earth, archive photographs and any other useful resources but not your own HER which should be (and is) a vital primary point for holding information about the historic environment of North Tyneside. The use of this resource should be encouraged.. | | | | advice of the County Archaeologist, GIS sources..." |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151746 | Para. 9.3 Object. Add to this that design impacts on the Borough's image, a point which is made in S9.5 but that only relates to highly visible locations. Early on in the plan LPCD 15's Objective no. 12- Enhancing Image says that "high quality design will be a requirement of ALL developments" [my emphasis]. So not just at highly visible locations. | | High Quality Design | Comments noted. The council seeks high quality design throughout the borough. The policy has now been amended for clarity. | Policy now says "To support the Council's objectives for enhancing North Tyneside's image and attractiveness, exemplar design solutions and architectural excellence will be actively supported and encouraged at the following key areas and sites of major change.." |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151748 | Art in the built environment and design quality Object North Tyneside Council has a good reputation for incorporating art/public art, in its widest sense, into the environment, going back as far as the work done by Freeform Arts, e.g. in school grounds. I'm not suggesting some 'percent for art' policy that can turn out to be tokenistic or a half-hearted tick-box effort by unwilling developers. But there is an opportunity as part of design quality and construction to incorporate art into the materials and design of buildings in a way that ordinary people will like. The Stag Line building in North Shields is an example (even though at the time more of a tasteful advert). The old 'bobbles' (artist designed and | | High Quality Design | Further amendments to policy Design of development to point (e) to read 'A design responsive to the existing landscape, topography and character of the locations context, incorporating where appropriate innovative features and statements of artistic quality;' changed from 'A responsive design to benefit heating, cooling and lighting'. | Amendments made. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | made finials) on the bank top railings at North Shields would be another: so popular that they all got stolen! Art was incorporated into many features of 'delight' in the environmental improvement scheme carried out a few years ago at 'The Triangle' North Shields, and the feature on the corner of Albion and Preston Roads is another. There are many other examples I could give from elsewhere (like terracotta vegetables done to relieve the bland/blank wall of a Tesco supermarket service yard in High Road Leyton, London; although there are nicer ones but harder to describe in text). The Plans design policies and text should promote art in the design and materials used in new developments that is appropriate in scale (although it doesn't have to be relevant to the building or use). Doing this would help make for a sense of place, be very locally distinctive, and help make places in North Tyneside "where people want to live", as long as done well. | | | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152166 | Paragraph 9.3- well designed buildings are those which respond positively to their context and relationship to the historic environment. This relationship also requires, where applicable, new-build to respectfully incorporate those heritage assets which make a positive contribution to that context. Policy and commentary should acknowledge this. | | High Quality Design | Comments noted. The policy states "Designs should be specific to the place, based on a clear analysis and respond to the characteristics of the site, its wider context and the surrounding area." We feel this addresses the point raised. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805689 | | | LP2015897 | The first problem that needs to be tackled in all of our town centres is the massive litter problem. The visual impact of clean, tidy streets would be enormous. Many people appear to have long forgotten what a clean | | Image and the Public Realm | Comments noted. The Planning system primarily deals with the built environment. The Local Plan or Planning system are not able to manage litter. The Council have a Streetcare team who deal with litter issues | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | pavement/verge/road/roundabout/hospital/school (I could go on) looks like and seem to accept litter as the norm. But, as we all know, when an area is looking down and out and sorry for itself, the problem can affect people's well-being and lead to increased health issues and rising crime. | | | and they are aware of your concerns. Residents are encouraged to report issues by calling the team or via an online form: http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/403/report-untidy-streets-and-overflowing-litter-bins | |
| 396238 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20152089 | General. 1. Would like to see more recognition of need to have plans for regeneration of former mining villages, especially Dudley and Seaton Burn so that development of current empty sites will allow some structure to the village in the future and provide for current unmet need. 2. As the Northern Gateway (Sandy Lane Bypass) has been omitted from the Plan and there are proposals for further extensive house building in the area as well as the development of the Weetslade Industrial site there is a special need to consider future traffic flows and movements. Work to the south of the Sandy Lane roundabout in front of Gosforth Park is long overdue but Sandy Lane itself has been over capacity since the 70s ... | | Image and the Public Realm | Comment noted. The importance of the North West and the regeneration of villages in the North West are recognised in Policy S1.1 with further detail provided in the North West Villages section. Policies referring to the North West will be amended to "North West Villages" rather than "North West Communities". Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for junction improvements (including along the A1056) to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152164 | 9. The Built and Historic Environment Paragraph 9.1 -the protection of the historic environment is a key contributor to achieving sustainable development. Existing buildings possess embodied energy and their reuse and adaptation assists with reducing energy and waste disposal needs. Sequentially, reuse and adaptation should be preferred to demolition and new-build. | | The Built Environment 9 | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 588278 | | RESIDENT | LP2015426 | There is no reference to the Council's preferred approach to minimising energy use being "fabric first". This minimises year on | | DM 9.1 Sustainable Design and | The materials used in the construction of buildings are now considered through Building Regulations. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|------------------------|
| | | | | year energy use rather than the now outmoded Merton Rule approach for bolting on or retrofitting renewable technologies which do not reduce the basic energy requirement but only generate that energy is less environmentally damaging ways. | | Construction | | |
| 638512 | | | LP2015611 | I was disturbed to learn that solar panels (strictly speaking, photovoltaic cells) would not be fitted as a matter of course to the new houses planned for Murton Village. It was explained to me at the consultation session at the new Whitley Bay library that the houses themselves would be insulated to a very high standard, which is commendable. But where were the solar panels? If it is not council policy to fit solar panels to all new-build properties, it should be. And if it is not changed by the council I will raise this through the Labour Party, of which I am a lowly member. Council builders (if there are any left) should be ordered by the council to fit solar panels. Private builders should be ordered to do the same, and if they refuse, sack them and get other builders who would accept the council's orders. At present prices, to add £1,000 or £2,000 to the price of a house of, perhaps, £150,000 would not be noticed by a buyer if they can get a mortgage. The solar panels should be fitted not only to keep electricity bills down but also to sell clean energy to the national grid. That is the main point. We have to turn each house/school/library into a mini power station, so that the whole of Tyneside can become a huge power station made up of individual solar panels. I know the council fits | | DM 9.1 Sustainable Design and Construction | Comments noted. Paragraph 59. of the NPPF states that "Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally." | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | some solar panels to schools and some houses, but what exactly is the council's policy? Everyone knows it is more efficient to fit solar panels as part of the building process, rather than retro-fit them. I would be willing to discuss this personally with the planning team/the Mayor/individual councillors but would hope you could first explain exactly what council policy is on solar panels. | | | | |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151106 | Green Party We support this policy as far as it goes and look forward to seeing it implemented. However design embraces not only sustainable buildings but includes layout, relationship to each other and their function in supporting sustainable communities. New build housing development offers socially responsible developers and planners the opportunity to create the infrastructure for sustainable communities which anticipate climate change and the need for zero carbon emissions. | | DM 9.1 Sustainable Design and Construction | Comments noted. It is understood that design doesn't just lie within the buildings which is reflected in Local Plan policies. For instance DM9.2 (now Policy DM6.2) discusses the relationship of buildings and spaces. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151257 | DM9.1 Sustainable Design and Construction Our Client supports this proposed policy; it is in line with the NPPF (7, 17, 18, 93, 95, 103, 143 and 156). | | DM 9.1 Sustainable Design and Construction | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151368 | Policy DM9:1. Sustainable design and construction. CPRE welcomes this policy. | | DM 9.1 Sustainable Design and Construction | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151737 | 53. The policy identifies that developments should seek to minimise their carbon emissions through a variety of mechanisms including exploring renewable and low carbon energy, energy efficiency and passive solar. The Council will be aware that the recent ministerial statement on 25th March 2015 | | DM 9.1 Sustainable Design and Construction | Policy has been deleted as it is no longer necessary and in some parts is not consistent with national policy. Further detail below: In terms of energy efficiency this will now be implemented through Building Regulations. Parts A and B in the policy are therefore no | Amendments made |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | sets out the government's response to the Housing Standards Review. In terms of energy and energy efficiency the statement makes clear that these will be implemented through the impending changes to the Building Regulations and other standards should not be applied. The Council will therefore be unable to implement the elements relating to energy in housing developments. It is therefore recommended that these elements be deleted. | | | <p>longer relevant.</p> <p>Part D refers to SUDS is sufficiently covered in other parts of the plan.</p> <p>Part E refers to the use of locally sourced materials which is more good practice than policy.</p> <p>Part F refers to waste management which can be referenced in the waste section of the plan.</p> <p>The following point has been added to policy DM9.2 (now Policy DM6.2) 'design of new development':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximise the use of passive solar design to benefit heating, cooling and lighting. | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151745 | DM9.1 b, e, Object. Policy should be added to in order to promote long-lasting materials and construction techniques that don't need the expense and effort of maintenance, i.e. ones that won't need replacing or maintaining and in these ways thus be more sustainable. Even if the longer lasting material has higher embodied energy. (Purely as one example- aluminium is high in embodied energy but very long lasting compared to almost any other building material). Developers building for sale will do what is cheap knowing that the maintenance liability will be borne by the homebuyer. Institutional developers and housing associations tend to consider whole life or design life issues/costs better. Supporting text should be added to, to explain this. | | DM 9.1 Sustainable Design and Construction | Following the government's response to the Housing Standards Review we can not include policies which require higher standards of sustainable materials. This issue is now considered as part of Building Regulations. | No amendments proposed. |
| 830576 | Taylor Wimpey | DEVELOPER | LP20151985 | Policy DM9.1 sets out the Council's preferred policy on sustainable design and construction. | | DM 9.1 Sustainable | Following the government's response to the Housing Standards Review we can not | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | The principles of the policy relate to reducing carbon dioxide emissions and energy consumption, albeit it is noted there is no specific target set out within the policy. Whilst this is the case, the Government is expected to implement the findings of its housing standards review imminently, including removing all such policies from planning considerations, and placing standard requirements within the building regulations. On this basis, the policy is neither necessary nor consistent with the national policy agenda. We trust these representations will be taken into account as part of the Council's preparation of its emerging Local Plan and generally support the direction of the Emerging Plan. In the meantime, we look forward to discussing the Emerging Plan with the Council further and being informed of any future consultation on this and any other planning policy documents. | | Design and Construction | include policies which require higher standards of sustainable materials. This issue is now considered as part of Building Regulations. | |
| 900788 | | DEVELOPER | LP20151994 | Whilst our client supports the encouragement of developments to seek to minimise their carbon emissions, it is important to ensure that the expectation to implement the various measures sought in Policy DM9.1 do not compromise the viability of schemes. It is therefore recommended that the wording of Policy DM9.1 is reworded as follows: 'To ensure that future developments meet high standards of sustainable design and construction, all development proposals, subject to viability, are expected to'. | | DM 9.1 Sustainable Design and Construction | Comments noted. Detailed development viability will be discussed at the planning application stage. | No amendments proposed. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152048 | Policy DM 9.1 sets out the authority's policy on sustainable design and construction. Sustainable construction and design is | | DM 9.1 Sustainable Design and | Following the government's response to the Housing Standards Review we can not include policies which require higher | None. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | | something that Persimmon are heavily involved with at a local and national level. We are aware that National government are pulling together all previous requirements in terms of Code for Sustainable Homes, lifetime homes and Zero Carbon initiatives into the existing Building Regulations structure to which all new developments are beholden regardless. This policy as currently worded is objected to for the above and following reasons: Sub-criteria (a) within this policy seeks additional requirements over and above national building regulations which we object to. In addition the policy wording sets a requirement of "exploring opportunities for renewable energy" and that this should be done via the submission of a Sustainability Statement. While the requirement for this statement is normal and correct how an applicant would go about "exploring opportunities for" within a statement is questionable and seems contrary to the requirements of the NPPF. | | Construction | standards of sustainable materials. This issue is now considered as part of Building Regulations. | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152165 | Policy DM9.1 -I would suggest the following: '(e) re-use existing buildings, especially historic buildings and those at risk, and materials on site and aim to use locally sourced and recyclable materials; .. .' The caveat 'where possible' is unhelpful as a qualification. It provides neither clarity as to the circumstances in which the policy might or might not apply, nor allows more flexibility than is provided for in planning legislation. | | DM 9.1 Sustainable Design and Construction | Comments noted. It is not considered necessary to specifically mention historic buildings and those at risk - the policy refers to all existing buildings, and the relevant heritage policies support the cause of protecting historic buildings and those at risk. "Where possible" will be removed. | "Where possible" removed from criterion e. |
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeolog | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATI | LP20152119 | I am pleased that the Historic Environment Record is mentioned here. | | S 9.11 Heritage Assets | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | y Officer | ON | | | | | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151376 | Policy S9:11. Heritage Assets. CPRE supports this policy. | | S 9.11 Heritage Assets | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152176 | Paragraph 9.52- whilst the historic environment (for the most part) is flexible and accommodating of respectful change, and can (and does) positively contribute to a vibrant Borough, it makes that contribution irrespective of whether it is subject to 'development' or not. Simply by being maintained it generates character, local distinctiveness, and a unique sense of place. | | S 9.11 Heritage Assets | Comments noted. Paragraph will be rewritten. | Para 9.53 (now para 9.23) now reads "The built environment rarely stays static and as part of that, heritage assets or their settings can be subject to change. Heritage assets should not be viewed as an obstacle to change; indeed their presence, ongoing maintenance or development can positively contribute to a vibrant Borough. However, constructive guidance needs to be in place to ensure they are appropriately conserved." |
| 901309 | Council for British Archaeology North | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152210 | Your residents, officers and members have in the past played their part in the conservation of historically important remains and we are pleased the proposed plan, recognises the need to continue to do so in S9.11 and DM9.12. | | S 9.11 Heritage Assets | Comments noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152121 | I am pleased that archaeological recording is mentioned here, and the need for heritage reports to be submitted to the Historic Environment Record (HER). I would add that important heritage assets may warrant formal publication of the results of the recording in an archaeological journal or similar. | | DM 9.12 Protection, Preservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets | Comments noted. | Final line within policy now reads "Any heritage reports prepared as part of a development scheme will be submitted for inclusion on the Tyne and Wear Historic Environment |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | Paragraph 141 of the NPPF states that "they [LPAs] should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact" Whilst in most cases the deposition of the record with the HER is appropriate, in some instances the heritage asset will be significant enough to warrant the publication of the results to ensure that they are publicly accessible. We frequently request that a publication condition is imposed on decision notices. | | | | Record (HER) and published where considered appropriate." |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151377 | Policy DM9:12. CPRE supports this policy. | | DM 9.12 Protection, Preservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152177 | Policy DM9.12 contains policy on 'enabling' development. This policy does not fully accord with English Heritage advice. As written the policy seeks to resist development that would detrimentally impact upon a heritage asset unless it forms part of an enabling scheme, thereby accepting that some harm may be justified. The first test in our advice is that enabling development must secure the asset without causing harm to it. | | DM 9.12 Protection, Preservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets | Comments noted. Agreed that this is not clear and will be removed. The supporting text directs readers to the Historic England guidance on enabling development. | "or it forms part of an enabling development package that would provide positive heritage benefits to heritage assets identified as at risk." removed from policy. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152177 | Paragraph 9.54- I would suggest the following: 'The settings of heritage assets can contribute significantly to their enjoyment through, for example, 'views, experience and approaches ... '. By this means it is acknowledged that setting can contribute in other ways too. | | DM 9.12 Protection, Preservation and Enhancement of Heritage | Comment noted. Agree with suggestion and will amend accordingly. | "for example" added to para 9.55 (now para 9.27). |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | Assets | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152177 | Paragraph 9.58- I would suggest- ' ... enabling development may be supported where ... '. | | DM 9.12 Protection, Preservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets | Comment noted. Agree with suggestion and will amend accordingly. | "is supported" now changed to "may be supported" in para 9.59 (now para 9.31). |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151260 | DM9.13 Archaeological Heritage Our Client supports the proposed policy to protect, enhance and promote the Borough's archaeological heritage, in line with the NPPF (17 and 128). However, our Client requests that the LPA give some guidance as to when or where an archaeological desk based assessment, or a full archaeological excavation would be required. | | DM 9.13 Archaeological Heritage | Comment noted. Further information will be added. The policy already explains when full archaeological excavation would be required. It is not possible, in light of the unknowns associated with buried remains, to be particularly detailed. | "The need to undertake archaeological assessment and evaluation or to carry out further archaeological work is determined by the information in the HER and by North Tyneside Council on the advice of its archaeological specialists." added to para 9.62 (now para 9.33). |
| 805069 | Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152125 | Please reword the sentence which starts "when determining applications that propose development to remains and their settings". Full archaeological excavation is rarely required at pre-decision/determination stage. The preliminary evaluation, which would assess the importance, date and degree of survival of the remains, would be required in order to determine the application. It would then be decided whether the remains on the site warrant preservation in-situ or whether it would be acceptable for the remains to be subject to full archaeological excavation which would allow the site to be developed. Such excavation is usually conditioned. I would therefore reword this sentence: "The | | DM 9.13 Archaeological Heritage | Comments noted. Policy rewritten. | DM9.13 (now Policy DM6.7) reworded to include suggested sentence. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | results of the preliminary evaluation will determine whether the remains warrant preservation in-situ, protection and enhancement or whether they require full archaeological excavation in advance of development". | | | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151378 | Policy DM9:13. Archaeological heritage. CPRE supports this policy. | | DM 9.13 Archaeological Heritage | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152178 | Policy DM9.13 -the NPPF does not separate archaeology from other heritage asset types. | | DM 9.13 Archaeological Heritage | We acknowledge that the NPPF does not separate archaeology from other heritage asset types. However, due to the specific nature of how works to assets archaeological interest are dealt with, we have included a specific policy to cover them. This makes clear the specific requirements of such works and avoids an over-long policy that covers all heritage assets. The County Archaeologist has expressed her support for a separate section. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152178 | Enhancement' is a difficult concept in relation to archaeology, and is generally considered to be not possible, save in respect of access, understanding and interpretation. As ed, the third paragraph contains a contradiction in that it simultaneously requires preservation in situ and full excavation. This may be resolved if the policy were re-structured to produce a sequence of separate, distinct and effective archaeological conservation policies which give priority to the physical preservation in situ of nationally important sites, whilst ensuring that sites of lesser importance are adequately safeguarded in line with the framework set out in NPPF guidance which | | DM 9.13 Archaeological Heritage | Comments noted. The County Archaeologist has made similar comments and the policy has been amended accordingly. | See amendments following County Archaeologist comments. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | requires proper assessment/evaluation and appropriate mitigation measures to reconcile the needs of development with the archaeological interest. Where preservation in situ is not justified using the guidance in the NPPF, preservation by record should be required subject to the terms set out. | | | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152178 | Paragraph 9.63 implies that the application of Policy DM9.13 will help secure the integration of heritage protection and economic regeneration at the Swan Hunter yard. However, archaeological potential on this site is being handled in a quite separate and specific way which responds to its Enterprise Zone status and the Local Development Order (LDO) governing development in it. The commentary accompanying this policy should make this distinction clear. | | DM 9.13 Archaeological Heritage | This paragraph will be removed to avoid confusion. Hadrian's Wall WHS also has its own policy. | Paragraph removed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151379 | Policy AS9:14. CPRE supports this policy. | | AS 9.14 Town Centre Conservation Area | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899323 | | | LP20151613 | The Council is proposing a Conservation Area in Wallsend Town Centre as shown in Map 13. NewRiver Retail notes the Council's response to the previous consultation comments submitted in January 2014. Our Client does not support the inclusion of the Forum Shopping Centre in the Conservation Area boundary and does not consider it to be appropriate given the shopping centre was built in the 1960s and does not have many of the qualities of the rest of the High Street. The proposed designation is therefore unjustified and could lead to unnecessary restrictions to future development. NewRiver | | AS 9.14 Town Centre Conservation Area | Comments noted. Conservation areas are long-term designations and inclusion of a building or space takes into consideration its potential redevelopment. You consider that the Forum building has little special interest; however it does form part of the streetscape and contributes to the setting of the wider area, and any development to the building would affect the area as a whole. Nevertheless, the boundary as published is a suggestion and would be subject to further research, full consultation and Cabinet consideration before designation. This will be explained in the text. | "A final boundary would be subject to further research and consultation." has been added to para 9.67 (now para 11.31). |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | Retail recommends that the Forum Shopping Centre is excluded from the proposed Conservation Area boundary. | | | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152179 | Paragraphs 9.64-9.69 deal with the desirability of designating a conservation area for Wallsend Town Centre. English Heritage supports such an initiative, and welcomes especially the inclusion of Segedunum within the suggested area boundary. The even closer integration of the town centre and the river would be achieved were the boundary to take in land up to the river itself. Paragraph 9.69- in the context of conservation area designation, consideration should also be given to positive management, which may involve the removal of certain permitted development rights. | | AS 9.14 Town Centre Conservation Area | Comments noted. The boundary is still a and would be subject to further research and consultation. This will be explained in the text. The LPA would continue positively managing the CA after designation; this will be reflected in the text. | "A final boundary would be subject to further research and consultation." has been added to para 9.67 (now para 11.31). "Once designated, the LPA will continue to positively manage the character and appearance of the area, as set out in policy S6.5." added to para 9.70 (now para 11.35). |
| 901309 | Council for British Archaeology North | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152220 | Wallsend Priority Investment and Regeneration Area: We welcome the proposed extension to Conservation Areas within Wallsend, especially for its inclusion of the Segedunum Roman Fort and Baths . However we also draw attention to the exclusion of that the triangle of land which includes the site of the former Carrville Methodist Church, including both the excavated remains of the Wallsend B Pit (consolidated as part of the Museum site) and adjacent Hadrian's Wall, as well as reconstruction of Hadrian's Wall, defensive pits and ditch. We would suggested this area should be considered for inclusion within the proposals for the Conservation Area and protected, as crucial to Wallsend's part of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site (where the contemporary | | AS 9.14 Town Centre Conservation Area | Comments noted. The boundary is still a and would be subject to further research and consultation. This will be explained in the text. | A final boundary would be subject to further research and consultation. has been added to para 9.67. (now para 11.31) |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | nature of wall extension to Wallsend and the fort demonstrated), as well as of the regionally significant Wallsend B Pit Colliery remains as a reminder of our coal-mining heritage.. This would contribute to your declared aim of AS1.2f and could add to your 4.20 and 5.11, DM9.15a to AS9.15c. These sites would also fit within your own definitions of 5.12 as tourist sites. | | | | |
| 396449 | Cyclists Touring Club | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015586 | Segedunum and Hadrian's Wall World Heritage Site 9, now Site E008, .71. The Hadrian Cycleway should be The Hadrian's Cycleway. | | AS 9.15 Wallsend: Segedunum Roman Fort and Hadrian's Wall WHS | Agreed. The suggested amendment will be made. | Amended to "Hadrian's Cycleway" |
| 630955 | | | LP2015769 | I am disappointed not to find in the plan, that the opportunity has not been taken whilst planning the redevelopment of Swan Hunters site to extend Segedunum down to the river bank sufficiently to restore the stones from the last "mile castle" to the place they were removed from during the original Swan Hunter shipyard development. | | AS 9.15 Wallsend: Segedunum Roman Fort and Hadrian's Wall WHS | Policy set out within the Local Plan reflects the already designated Enterprise Zone and Local Development Order in place for the Swan hunter site in Wallsend. The Local Plan encourages proposals that respect and enhance the heritage value of the World Heritage Site and would support such actions where deliverable. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151380 | Policy AS9:15: CPRE supports this policy. | | AS 9.15 Wallsend: Segedunum Roman Fort and Hadrian's Wall WHS | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152180 | Policy AS9.15 should make clear that the intention is to safeguard the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site and those attributes which define it. It should be noted that the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations are applied differently in areas where LDOs exist. | | AS 9.15 Wallsend: Segedunum Roman Fort and Hadrian's Wall WHS | Comments noted. Wording of policy will be changed to be more in line with suggestion. Regardless of the LDO, an EIA is required for developments likely to significantly effect the WHS. This policy would apply to areas outside of the LDO boundary too. | Criterion a changed to "Ensure the safeguarding of the Outstanding Universal Value of the WHS and those attributes which define it,..." |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152180 | Paragraph 9.71 -reference should also be made to the National Trail. | | AS 9.15 Wallsend: Segedunum Roman Fort and Hadrian's Wall WHS | Comments noted. Reference to the National Trail will be added. | Para 9.72 (now para 1.37) now reads "The Hadrian Cycleway and the Hadrian's Wall Path National Trail pass and for those following the entire routes the Fort is amongst the first, or last, major Roman archaeological site they would come across." |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152180 | Paragraph 9.72 needs recasting. Hadrian's Wall Trust no longer exists, and work is now being undertaken on updating the Management Plan for 2015 onward. Policy AS9.15 should not only support the Management Plan - it should help deliver it. | | AS 9.15 Wallsend: Segedunum Roman Fort and Hadrian's Wall WHS | Comments noted, appropriate amendments will be made. | Para 9.73 (now para 11.38) now reads "The related policy above seeks to support and deliver the aspirations of the Hadrian's Wall Management Plan 2015-2019. The Management Plan provides an important basis for proposals to enhance and capitalise on the opportunities (for example, in education) created by the archaeology, and informs decisions that may affect the WHS. The Council will continue its working relationship as part of the The Hadrian's Wall Partnership Board to support the implementation of the Management Plan and to work on future strategies." |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152180 | Paragraph 9.73- the use of the word 'however' implies opposites to separate and | | AS 9.15 Wallsend: | Comments noted, this will be amended. | para 9.74 (now para 11.39) "However, it is also noted |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | balance, which is not/should not be the case. | | Segedunum Roman Fort and Hadrian's Wall WHS | | that the riverside has its own heritage and role in Wallsend. " now reads "The riverside has its own heritage and role in Wallsend. " |
| 588278 | | RESIDENT | LP2015428 | This commitment is to be applauded but needs to be underpinned by action and successful outcomes. Spanish City is not only a tourist asset but should be developed with and for the local community. Working with and supporting the Big Local group is one way of demonstrating engagement and commitment which is visible to residents. | | AS 9.16 The Spanish City | Comment noted and support welcomed. The Local Plan will continue to work with the local community to allow residents the opportunities to influence future planning policies of the local area. | No amendments proposed. |
| 797386 | | | LP20151081 | Greater interaction and communication between the Council and local residents and businesses will make progress on this quicker and easier. | | AS 9.16 The Spanish City | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151381 | Policy AS9:16 Spanish City. CPRE welcomes the plans to regenerate this area. Development of enhanced access by public and sustainable transport would be a constructive addition to the policy. | | AS 9.16 The Spanish City | Comments noted. It is considered that sustainable transport options to the coast are supported through the general transport policies and through policy AS10.5 (now Policy 8.23) Coastal Transport. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151960 | Natural England supports the requirement of this policy to be compliant with policy DM8.6 in order to ensure that there are no adverse effects on internationally designated sites. | | AS 9.16 The Spanish City | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152181 | Paragraph 9.75 contains typing errors and does not read clearly. | | AS 9.16 The Spanish City | Comments noted, this paragraph was not clear and will be rewritten. | para 9.76 (now para 11.76) now reads "The regeneration of The Spanish City presents a fantastic opportunity to support and compliment concurrent regeneration in the town centre, at Whitley Park, and indeed, |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | along the whole North Tyneside coast. Planning approval has been granted for the redevelopment of The Spanish City but the final end users are still to be decided. The aim is for a mix of complementary uses, such as residential, community and leisure uses that would benefit the area with a focus on the quality and family friendly appeal. " |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152181 | Policy AS9.16- I would suggest: ' ... make a positive contribution ... '. | | AS 9.16 The Spanish City | Comment noted, this will be amended. | Policy AS9.16 (now Policy AS8.18) now reads ' ... make a positive contribution ... ' and para 9.75 amended. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151382 | Policy AS9:17 Town Halls etc. CPRE broadly supports this policy. Prioritisation of the alternative uses might be helpful to better manage community benefit. | | AS 9.17 Town Hall, Police Court, Fire Station and Public Baths | Comment noted. Whilst the potential value of this approach is recognised, providing uses proposed for the building are compatible with the listed building it would be detrimental to securing its reuse and enhancement if a prioritisation limited any particular use over another. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152182 | Policy AS9.17- I would suggest the uses identified should 'be supported where there would be no unjustified adverse effect upon their heritage significance: ... '. | | AS 9.17 Town Hall, Police Court, Fire Station and Public Baths | Comments noted and policy will be amended in accordance with suggestion. | "be supported where there would be no unjustified adverse effect upon their heritage significance:" added to Policy AS9.17 (now Policy AS8.10). |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151383 | Policy AS9:18 Engineering Research Centre. CPRE broadly supports this policy. The word "negatively" in the third bullet point is | | AS 9.18 Former Engineering | Comment noted. The word "negatively" was used because some fragmentation of the site would be acceptable. This should be | "Do not negatively fragment or asset strip the building." has been |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | superfluous and should be deleted. | | Research Centre | changed to "unacceptably" to be clearer. | amended to "Not unacceptably..." |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152183 | Paragraph 9.82 repeats paragraph 9.74. Policy AS9.18- the proviso suggested in respect of Policy AS9.17 should apply here too. | | AS 9.18 Former Engineering Research Centre | Comments noted. Para 9.82 is repetition and will be removed. Policy will be amended in accordance with suggestion. | Para 9.82 removed. Policy AS9.18 (now Policy AS8.28) has been completely rewritten and now reads "The Council will seek and support proposals for the use of the buildings and site where there would be no unjustified adverse effect upon their heritage significance. Proposed uses should take advantage of the facilities and accommodation that Block A and Block B can provide, including the potential for office, light manufacturing and retailing, with regard given to the potential for additional residential development at this location. Proposals should also: Demonstrate a clear understanding of the building and the impact of the works, Propose a compatible use with the buildings and the surroundings, and Not unacceptably fragment or asset strip the building." |
| 588278 | | RESIDENT | LP2015427 | The aspiration to good design (in its broadest sense rather than merely aesthetic) is to be | | DM 9.2 Design of | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | applauded. however, if recently approved examples of market housing are any guide the approach is not being robustly and consistently applied. Earsdon View, Northumberland Park and the current development above Red House Farm estate in Monkseaton are standard developer templates with fancy names and grand aspirations but little evidence of 'design' in the sense described in the Plan Policies. Design Codes and Design Review need to be enshrined in the Plan as mechanisms to ensure quality and value. | | Development | | |
| 898630 | | | LP2015907 | Please do not allow identikit houses to be built. Design is so important. For large, new developments, please try - as much as you can - to make it look like the development has evolved rather than transplanted, which would make it look like the area has grown over a period of time and therefore make it more acceptable to those living around it. | | DM 9.2 Design of Development | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151258 | DM9.2 Design of Development Our Client supports the proposed policy. It is a core planning principle of the NPPF (17) to "always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings" Our Client would suggest that although designs of development should be particular to a place and respond to the characteristics of a site, it is also important that this policy allows for a range of house types and density levels to meet the objectives of the plan, including the provision of affordable housing and also large executive housing. | | DM 9.2 Design of Development | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151369 | Policy DM9.2. CPRE also welcomes this policy. | | DM 9.2 Design of Development | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151738 | 54. The HBF is supportive of the changes to Policy DM9.2 which now encourages the use of Building for Life rather than it being a mandatory requirement. These amendments accord with our previous comments upon this policy. | | DM 9.2 Design of Development | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151747 | DM9.2 and Para. 9.4 Object. The Council Plan 2014-18 has an overarching priority: Our Places A: "be places that people like living in...". This phrase should at least be placed word-for-word in para.9.4, even though that mentions live, work, play, spend time, and in policy DM9.2. | | DM 9.2 Design of Development | Comments noted. Some wording will be changed in the accompanying text to better reflect the Council priority, although it is not considered that it has to be word-for-word. The policy is the way to achieve the priority, rather than the priority itself, so it does not need to include those words. | Para 9.4 (now para 9.5) now reads "which to enjoy living, working, playing and spending time in". |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152050 | Policy DM9.2 sets out the authority's policy objectives in relation to design of new development. This policy is supported and sets out a logical set of criteria for which development can be assessed. We do however question if the Council are intending to formally screen and assess developments against the 12 building for life criteria or simply use this as a guide? | | DM 9.2 Design of Development | The Council considers that BFL12 is a useful tool which we would encourage to be used to support the design quality of major housing applications. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152167 | Policy DM9.2(e)- the amenity of all users of buildings and spaces should be protected, not just residents. | | DM 9.2 Design of Development | Comments noted. Acknowledged that use of "residents" suggests the policy only applies to residential development. | "and users of buildings and spaces." added to policy. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152051 | Policy DM9.3 sets out the authority's response to alterations or extensions to new buildings. This policy is supported however some of the wording is questioned as follows. Complementary design is supported however the policy describes how this could be either through "continued use of established design medium or via contrasting "contemporary | | DM 9.3 Extending Existing Buildings | Comments noted. Amendments made to DM9.3 (now Policy DM6.3). | Amendments made. Policy now reads 'Extensions should complement the form and character of the original building. This should be achieved either by continuation of the established design form, or |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | design" . For developments already of contemporary design this would not be a contrast. We propose that the policy be re worded to include "contrasting high quality design" . | | | | through appropriate contrasting, high quality design'. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152168 | Policy DM9.3 -this policy concerns adaptation of the existing building stock, but does not provide guidance in cases where works of alteration do not involve extensions. | | DM 9.3 Extending Existing Buildings | Comments noted. This policy was specifically about extending and "DM9.2 Design of Development" (now Policy DM6.2) concerns all other development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151370 | Policy DM9:4 Advertisements and signage CPRE broadly supports this policy. Explicit reference to limits on A-frames along a pavement might be helpful in addressing concerns from the blind and partially sighted community. | | DM 9.4 Advertisements and Signage | Comments noted. A boards cannot be controlled through the planning system, rather they are managed by the Highways team, who have a policy: http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/pls/portals/NTC_PSCM.PSCM_Web.download?p_ID=527042 | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152169 | Policy DM9.4 and paragraph 9.10- careful consideration should be given to all signage and its effect upon heritage assets and their settings. Whether illuminated or not, signs have the potential to harm the significance of heritage assets. | | DM 9.4 Advertisements and Signage | Comments noted. Acknowledged that advertisements and signage of any type can have an impact on heritage assets. Paragraph and supporting text to be amended accordingly. | Policy now reads "Careful consideration will be given to advertisements and signage effecting heritage assets or their settings, especially if illuminated, so as not to have an adverse impact on development." Supporting text now reads "Heritage assets can be sensitive to advertisements and signage, particularly if illuminated, as it can have a negative impact if incorrectly designed or insensitively placed" |
| 805724 | | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015278 | Support expressed generally for the policy and its reasoned justification. | | S 9.5 Improving Image | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151371 | Policy S9:5. Improving image. CPRE supports this policy. | | S 9.5 Improving Image | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152170 | Policy S9.5 -the final paragraph does not contain policy. If sites of substantial change and visibility are so important, the Council should commit to preparing masterplans and briefs to guide their development. | | S 9.5 Improving Image | Comments noted. Policy S9.5 (now S6.5) amended. | Amendments made. Final sentence now reads 'Any subsequent development proposal will be required to accord with any development briefs which are produced for these sites'. |
| 459177 | | RESIDENT | LP2015304 | Improvements are needed in North Shields town centre. The town centre needs investment and new shops and facilities, No dogs should be allowed into the park at Northumberland Square. | | AS 9.6 North Shields Town Centre: Public Realm | North Tyneside's Local Plan (2015) includes policies, such as S6.1 (now Policy S3.1) which support the growth and regeneration of the main town centres. The control of dogs within Northumberland Square is not something which can be enforced through the planning system. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898920 | Sustrans | | LP2015983 | Sustrans would be grateful if reference could be made to the need for high quality bicycle links into and through town centres stressing that this requirement should take precedence over and above surface level car parking (whether on or off street). | | AS 9.6 North Shields Town Centre: Public Realm | Comment noted. Greater reference to cycle routes and parking to be included in the Policy. | Policy criteria a) amended to include cycle routes in criteria a) and cycle parking in criteria d). |
| 797386 | | | LP20151078 | The Square is an important part of our local heritage and also important for attracting and keeping professional and other commercial enterprises in NT. There is a need for more good office space in at least some of the old Council buildings. I fear that their conversion into the wrong sort of residential units will have an adverse effect on business in North Shields. | | AS 9.6 North Shields Town Centre: Public Realm | The Local Plan prioritises the development of all main town centre uses within the borough's town centres, and proposals that address issues of underuse and vacancy are key priorities. Town centre uses include retail, leisure, office and residential development where in accordance with the wider proposed policies of the Local Plan. Viable development proposals that support these priorities for the town centres are supported to achieve their overall regeneration. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|--|
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151372 | Policy AS9:6. North Shields. CPRE supports this policy. | | AS 9.6 North Shields Town Centre: Public Realm | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152171 | Paragraph 9.13 onward- this section of the Plan contains a series of policies relating to heritage and townscape in the Sub-Areas. The focus is very much on public realm within these areas, yet very little policy concerns the buildings in which resides the majority of their heritage interest. In addition, the caveat 'where appropriate' in Policy AS9.6 and Policy AS9.7 means that even historic townscape may not survive plans to regenerate these areas. | | AS 9.6 North Shields Town Centre: Public Realm | Comments noted. Public realm issues have been identified in these areas. The Local Plan contains policies that support the protection and enhancement of all heritage assets, including support for their role in the regeneration of areas. Agree, "where appropriate" should be removed. | "where appropriate" removed from relevant part of policies relating to public realm in Whitley Bay and North Shields town centres. |
| 898920 | Sustrans | | LP2015984 | Sustrans would be grateful if reference could be made to the need for high quality bicycle links into and through town centres stressing that this requirement should take precedence over and above surface level car parking (whether on or off street). | | AS 9.7 Public Realm Improvements in Whitley Bay town centre | Comment noted. Policy does refer to the need to give greater priority to cyclists, improving the connectivity between town and seafront, including improvements to cycling infrastructure and seeking to implement cycle priority schemes. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151373 | Policy AS9:7. Whitley Bay town centre. CPRE supports this policy. | | AS 9.7 Public Realm Improvements in Whitley Bay town centre | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151959 | Natural England supports the requirement of this policy to be compliant with policy DM8.6 in order to ensure that there are no adverse effects on internationally designated sites. | | AS 9.7 Public Realm Improvements in Whitley Bay town centre | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152172 | Paragraph 9.13 onward- this section of the Plan contains a series of policies relating to heritage and townscape in the Sub-Areas. The focus is very much on public realm within these areas, yet very little policy concerns the | | AS 9.7 Public Realm Improvements in Whitley Bay town centre | Comments noted. Public realm issues have been identified in these areas. The Local Plan contains policies that support the protection and enhancement of all heritage assets, including support for their role in the | "where appropriate" removed from relevant part of policies relating to public realm in Whitley Bay and North Shields town |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | buildings in which resides the majority of their heritage interest. In addition, the caveat 'where appropriate' in Policy AS9.6 and Policy AS9.7 means that even historic townscape may not survive plans to regenerate these areas. | | | regeneration of areas. Agree, "where appropriate" should be removed. | centres. |
| 901309 | Council fo British Archaeology North | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20152219 | We welcome the comments in the Built Environment AS9.7d section for historic features and layouts - the historic environment is total and we welcome that away from just sites, whether a building or street furniture, both in isolation and also more holistically. | | AS 9.7 Public Realm Improvements in Whitley Bay town centre | Comments noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 467670 | | RESIDENT | LP2015962 | As for shopping, we didn't need a pub restaurant, we need small businesses. Fresh fish Shops, butchers, Drapery, decent shoe shop, fashion retail, W.H Smith type shops. I know all this is called progress. Some progress I don't like. | | AS 9.8 Wallsend: High Street Improvements | Comments noted. Wallsend is identified as a priority area in the Local Plan and its improvement is supported by a range of policies. New business and shops are encouraged, and the Council's Regeneration team have ongoing work in the town centre to support this. The Planning system however is unable to control the exact kind of shop or particular retailers that could open. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898920 | Sustrans | | LP2015985 | Air quality in Wallsend High Street is poor, policies to reduce private through traffic are welcomed. Sustrans would be grateful if reference could be made to the need for high quality bicycle links into and through town centres stressing that this requirement should take precedence over and above surface level car parking (whether on or off street). | | AS 9.8 Wallsend: High Street Improvements | Comment noted. Policy does seek to ensure that future development in Wallsend town centre is safe and attractive with facilities that encourage visitors to walk or cycle to the town. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151374 | Policy AS9:8. Wallsend. CPRE supports this policy. | | AS 9.8 Wallsend: High Street Improvements | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152173 | Paragraph 9.13 onward- this section of the Plan contains a series of policies relating to heritage and townscape in the Sub-Areas. The focus is very much on public realm within these areas, yet very little policy concerns the buildings in which resides the majority of their heritage interest. In addition, the caveat 'where appropriate' in Policy AS9.6 and Policy AS9.7 means that even historic townscape may not survive plans to regenerate these areas. Furthermore, Policy AS9.8 does not commit (by the use of the word 'could') to safeguarding The Green conservation area, where measure (d) refers (in a perhaps ill-expressed way) to 'managing against any potential impacts ...'. | | AS 9.8 Wallsend: High Street Improvements | Comments noted. Public realm issues have been identified in these areas. The Local Plan contains policies that support the protection and enhancement of all heritage assets, including support for their role in the regeneration of areas. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151259 | AS9.9 Public Realm in the North West Communities Our Client supports the proposed policy as it will enhance the aesthetic quality of the North West area, which in turn will make the area more attractive to potential inward investment (residential and commercial). | | AS 9.9 Public Realm in the North West Communities | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151375 | Policy AS9:9 North West Communities: CPRE can support this policy but urges that care must be taken to protect wildlife corridors, open countryside and avoid damage to the Gosforth Nature Reserve and the Weetslade Colliery Park. Measures that emphasise the distinctiveness - not just the identities - of the different communities and settlements "" what used to be villages "" would be welcome. | | AS 9.9 Public Realm in the North West Communities | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152175 | Policy AS9.9(b)(i) is not ed as policy. | | AS 9.9 Public Realm in the North West | Comment noted, this will be amended. | Policy now reads "Good quality, attractive street furniture (for example, |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | Communities | | bins and seats) with the environs of shopping areas and community facilities being be the priority target." |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152189 | Paragraph I 0.73 - as with highway structures, many community facilities may be regarded as heritage assets, in respect of which careful maintenance can also form part of a positive strategy for the historic environment. Where a community facility of heritage value (an older school for example) is found to be no longer required, it is important for it not to be disposed of without first having devising a clear exit strategy which will secure its conservation and continued use thereafter. | | Community Infrastructure: Education, Health, Social | Comments noted. The Community Infrastructure and Heritage Assets policies work together to ensure that sufficient protection is afforded to community facilities with heritage significance. | No amendments proposed. |
| 878592 | | | LP20154 | A similar approach should be taken with other aspects, such as cycling. I think the mindset is still a bit in the present, and what is doable from a low base and in a somewhat apologetic way, rather than anticipating cultural shifts and different expectations in 5 to 10 years time. A general standard though would be to use the NICE guidelines which say that the default is for journeys less than 5 miles to be by cycling and less than 1 mile by walking. So one could make any development be contingent on improving connections from that development to places within a 5 mile radius such that one can reach any locality with greater than 100 houses (say) by a route physically separated from the road, i.e. fulfils the 8 year old test - would you let your 8 year old cycle along it. The planning team need to be cogniscent of the fact that N Tyneside has much higher rates of morbidity and mortality | | Connectivity and Transport | Policy is provided within the Local Plan to support and encourage walking and cycling as part of development, and the location of development sites within the Borough is such that walking and cycling, and accessibility to public transport are - or can readily be made to be viable and attractive options for residents. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>than the national average, despite those health outcomes directly attributable to healthcare being better than average and the fact that NHS spend is higher than anywhere else in the UK (inc Scotland). The missing component is of course lifestyle. NHS budgets will be squeezed and the only way we have any hope of rescuing this situation is if the population becomes less obese and fitter. Please reference extensively NICE guidelines PH5, as well as PH8 and PH41, which are all directed towards planners. It is critical you do the right thing to effect major change.</p> | | | | |
| 805252 | | RESIDENT | LP201545 | <p>I am pleased to see that there will now be some co-ordination of road works and other disruptions. The amount of road works in the region is ridiculous at the moment.</p> | | Connectivity and Transport | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 463028 | | | LP201574 | <p>After commuting to work on the Metro for the last dozen years I now have a job where driving is the most convenient way to travel on some days. The extreme levels of traffic congestion are just staggering. It is great to see businesses moving to North Tyneside and creating jobs at the Cobalt and Tyne Tunnel Trading Estate, but we have to get a grip on the traffic. North Tyneside either need to call a halt to development in this area (Site 106 etc). or dramatically improve the transport infrastructure. There is only one way off the Tyne Tunnel Trading estate, and there are only three roads off the Cobalt. They are not sufficient for the level of development that has taken place - it can take 15-20 minutes to get out of the Tyne Tunnel Trading Estate. Extending the Metro to run between Northumberland Park and Percy Main, with a</p> | | Connectivity and Transport | <p>Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. Support is noted for Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and the potential expansion of the Metro system to link Northumberland Park with Percy Main.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | Metro station at the South end of the Silverlink or the North end of the Tyne Tunnel Trading Estate is a fantastic idea. DO IT! I am put of using the Number 19 bus service as it looks like it is run by different bus companies at different times, so a day ticket bought in the morning may not be valid on my way back home. Far too confusing. | | | | |
| 890168 | | | LP201575 | Provision for cycling as a form of transport for shopping and commuting is currently lacking. Many car journeys (i.e. under 5 miles) could easily be done by bike if people were not scared by traffic. I hope the development results in continuous, well connected, safe and usable cycle infrastructure. | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements will aim to make it easier and safer to travel in the Borough and enable new developments to be well connected and also lead to improvements in cycle infrastructure wherever possible. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890169 | | | LP201580 | Please do all you can to improve the experience of cycling in the area. More than one person has said to me that they would willingly cycle if they were not so intimidated by the dangers of the roads. A coherently planned and properly connected set of cycle lanes would be one way of encouraging people to use their bikes more, thereby enhancing their health - and reducing carbon emissions. | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan sets out it clear focus to deliver improved accessibility whilst also reducing carbon emissions, primarily by encouraging active travel - walking and cycling. Working with the Council and its partners the Local Plan will seek to provide safe convenient and accessible routes for pedestrians, cyclists, horse-riders and other non-motorised modes of transport, using green infrastructure links where appropriate. | No amendments proposed. |
| 444503 | | RESIDENT | LP201589 | Do more footpaths (ramps), lower curbs, problem car parking | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan sets out it clear focus to deliver improved accessibility whilst also reducing carbon emissions, primarily by encouraging active travel - walking and cycling. Working with the Council and its partners the Local Plan will seek to provide safe convenient and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | accessible routes for pedestrians, cyclists, horse-riders and other non-motorised modes of transport, using green infrastructure links where appropriate. If you have any further queries regarding lowering kerbs or problem car parking I would suggest contact the Councils highways team (highways.environment@northtyneside.gov.uk or Tel: (0191) 643 6130) as these are not matters covered by the Local Plan. | |
| 890190 | | RESIDENT | LP201590 | The area from Billy Mill to Earsdon has reached saturation traffic wise any more housing will only make it worse. On Sundays before noon to go to Seaton Sluice, I have to go to North Shields then along the sea front. Via Monkseaton it would take me 1/2 hour and in the summer the sea front way will be just as bad. | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed. |
| 467822 | | RESIDENT | LP2015889 | Yes it time we has the trolley buses back the same as other parts of the EEC main land and the same as West part of the ex USSR and more caravan parks in Newcastle and North Tyneside and South Shields linking with North Tyneside, reopening more railway lines. | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan (Policy S10.3 (now S7.3)) supports the retention and protection of essential infrastructure that would facilitate sustainable passenger and freight connections, such as the Blyth and Tyne line and how this could lead to other improved connections throughout the Borough and wider Tyne and Wear region. The Council does support appropriate tourism accommodation in the Local Plan. | Policy S2.1 (a) (ii) 'and International Ferry Terminal.' added to end of the sentence |
| 898826 | | RESIDENT | LP2015937 | The Roads in North Tyneside are already congested. Priority transport improvements | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | suggested are not enough to take the amount of extra traffic created by this development. | | | the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Further assessments of the impacts of traffic generated by the growth suggested at the strategic sites of Killingworth Moor and Murton will be reflected in the Plan as it is prepared. | |
| 587121 | Nexus | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015963 | With regards to the latest , Nexus welcome: - the increased detail provided in relation to support for the Metro network. In particular, we welcome formal protection for the Cobalt Corridor and its potential station sites, and support for potential new Metro stations on the existing network (subject to feasibility study), as well as for our emerging Metro Strategy. -the high level of emphasis on public/sustainable transport provision in the two large new proposed housing sites at Murton and Killingworth Moor. This shows best-practice integration of public transport into strategic planning policy and development sites. -reiterated statements of support for enhancement of the local bus network across the Borough. | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805471 | | | LP20151128 | Your planned development around Forest Hall/ Backworth areas would put upwards of 6000 vehicles on the roads. Great Lime Road and Whitley Road and the Holystone | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | Roundabout and the A19 are already congested significantly at rush hour and also beyond these hours. The planned widening of roads does not help the matter as ultimately the traffic ends up at a bottleneck somewhere along the line. Problems at Silverlink remain an issue add another 1000 cars into the mix and the whole area will ground to a halt. Share the development of properties to a wider area and you share the traffic stressor easing the burden on specific routes and making the whole area more accessible. | | | and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Further assessments of the impacts of traffic generated by the growth suggested at the strategic sites of Killingworth Moor and Murton will be reflected in the Plan as it is prepared. | |
| 803900 | Northumberland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151537 | Connectivity and Transport The Council is committed to continuing to work with North Tyneside Council with regard to the strategic road network and junctions, through future Duty to Cooperate discussions and the commissioning of transport studies. Ashington, Blyth and Tyne Railway "" paragraph 10.19 The Council welcomes the acknowledgement that the reinstatement of passenger services over the Ashington, Blyth and Tyne Railway is seen as a key driver for growth in South East Northumberland and is a key aspiration of Northumberland County Council. The Council also supports the reference to the safeguarding of the route of the Ashington, Blyth and Tyne Railway line. | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899991 | Tyne and Wear Public Transport Users Group | RESIDENT | LP20151578 | Connectivity and Transport We look to N.T. Council for a reduction in carbon emissions, which will have to fall by 30% by 2030, as its contribution to holding back Climate Change, and we wonder how this will happen with the increase in housing and other development, with the implications of the increase in car | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. The First Objective of the Local Plan is to promote the renewable energy sector and developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption, whilst improving the Borough's resilience to the effects of climate change. This is reflected in Policies | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | ownership, rising rapidly in North East. We see more congestion as a result, causing more air pollution. We are aware that technology is moving quickly with the development of hybrid power sources based on Euro 6 diesel engines as well as vehicles powered by electricity or hydrogen. We are disappointed that the document does not take note of these emerging technologies and use them to set standards for public and goods transport in North Tyneside. We note that "Public Health England" suggests that, in 2014, diesel cars, lorries and buses emissions were responsible for the deaths of 500 people in Tyne and Wear, from lung cancer, strokes, heart disease and asthma. These illnesses are caused by the particulates and NOX from diesel exhaust emissions. This has huge economic costs for the health service as well as the impact on those who will suffer. 10.22 We want to see all the land safeguarded for the option of a heavy rail link referred to re the Port of Tyne. 10.28 We would like to see the restoration of a ferry link with Norway. | | | throughout the Plan that outline the Councils approach to minimise the need to travel and encourage the use of electric cars. The restoration of a ferry service to Norway falls outside the role of the Local Plan but the benefits of this route are referenced in Policy S5.1 (now S2.1). Comments relating to para 10.22 are noted but at this time a rail link is not currently considered necessary to support the economic development of the Port of Tyne, however, the possibility that this land may benefit from a new rail link to support freight movement to and from the north bank at some point in the future cannot be totally discounted. | |
| 396238 | North Tyneside Council | COUNCILLOR | LP20152090 | General. 1. Would like to see more recognition of need to have plans for regeneration of former mining villages, especially Dudley and Seaton Burn so that development of current empty sites will allow some structure to the village in the future and provide for current unmet need. 2. As the Northern Gateway (Sandy Lane Bypass) has been omitted from the Plan and there are proposals for further extensive house building in the area as well as the development of the Weetslade Industrial site there is a special | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. The importance of the North West and the regeneration of villages in the North West are recognised in Policy S1.1 with further detail provided in the North West Villages section of the Plan. Policies referring to the North West will be amended to "North west Villages" rather than "North West Communities". Traffic impacts from the amount of growth suggested in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work that has secured £150million funding for | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | need to consider future traffic flows and movements. Work to the south of the Sandy Lane roundabout in front of Gosforth Park is long overdue but Sandy Lane itself has been over capacity since the 70s ... | | | junction improvements (including along the A1056) to make it easier and safer to travel throughout the Borough. | |
| 808201 | | RESIDENT | LP20152110 | At peak times the roads through West Moor, Salters Lane and Benton Lane are deadlocked with the traffic often backed up from Killingworth right through to South Gosforth and beyond and Four Lane Ends and beyond. | | Connectivity and Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396449 | Cyclists Touring Club | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015590 | Comments on the North Tyneside Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan February 2015 3.56. Are the 22 miles of the national cycle network also included in the 78 miles of traffic free cycle paths and 143 miles of on road recommended quieter link roads? 3.57. Discusses would be more accurate than examines. Should the second rights of way be rights of way network? 3.59. Should the last sentence end with page 33 which shows current and proposed routes? 3.60. Hadrian's Cycle Way should be Hadrian's Cycleway (NCN 72) North Sea Cycle route would be better as: Coast and Castles Cycle Route (NCN 1) which is also part of the North Sea Cycle Route 3.61. Should the opening date of June 2015 be extended now that the contractors have gone in to administration? Map 5. The legend | | General and Funding | Comments noted. | The requested amendment has been made to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | needs to indicate which routes are currently available and which are proposed routes | | | | |
| 898589 | | RESIDENT | LP2015846 | I have made a brief examination of the above document and I am pleased to see that some of my concerns expressed in my letter of the 30th December 2013 have been addressed. However, much is still of concern. I note that some attempt has been made to provide details of the necessary infra structure to accommodate the major developments which are proposed. However, no indication is included as to how these requirements are to be funded. In particular the roads proposed to serve the developments on Killingworth Moor/Backworth. In my opinion, such costs should be borne by the Landowner /Developer, otherwise, the local tax payers will be subsidising the profits of the Developer and Land Owner. Piece meal development of several small sites will not provide the relevant sums. One major Development of the area(s) should generate enough profit to allow this to happen. | | General and Funding | Comment noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) is part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (which is available to view on the Council website - http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/pls/portals/NTC_PSCM.PSCM_Web.download?p_ID=558901) and this outlines the indicative costs for the infrastructure required to meet the levels of growth anticipated in the Local Plan. The IDS does outline that the funding for the major road works required for both Murton and Killingworth will be met by the developers. The Council is taking the approach that Masterplans for both areas will be required before development can take place so that the collective issues can be drawn together and not in isolation – this is the approach of Policy AS7.4 (now S4.4). | No amendments proposed. |
| 899991 | Tyne and Wear Public Transport Users Group | RESIDENT | LP20151576 | We noted that, in their proposed Voluntary partnership Agreement, the Bus Operators were insisting that services to any new development should, initially be funded by s106 agreements. In the event that the QCS were not to be agreed we are sure that this proposal will be resurrected. We take the view that if s106 money were to be used for the purpose of "'kick-starting' what was to become a commercial service then it should be regarded as a loan to be paid back once the service was established and profitable. We have a problem, in principle, with the idea | | General and Funding | Contributions to infrastructure provision are necessary where essential to ensure the sustianability of a scheme and to make it acceptable in planning. The role of s106 is to satisfy such shortfalls in infrascture that exist when a development comes forward. If a s106 contribution were required to "kick start" a bus service this would be mitigating a shortfall in demand during the early years of a development to ensure the service is in palce and attractive to new residents before they adopt alternative modes of travel. That funding will have been paid towards a | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | that s106 money should be used as an investment to generate profits for commercial interests. | | | service that was provided - it would not be logical for that service to then be refunded and therefore be delivered free of charge by the operator. | |
| 808917 | BDW North East | LAND DEVELOPER | LP20151775 | BDW note that the councils seeks to maximise contributions from developers for infrastructure projects. The council must ensure that the level of contribution being sought is viable. It is important that the level of contribution does not make the development unviable and stall development. In accordance with the Harman guidance, local authorities should include a viability cushion to ensure the development can proceed. The council must ensure the level of contribution being sought is viable. | | General and Funding | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151971 | Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2015 Natural England support the inclusion of a chapter on Open Space. Areas of open space can contribute towards a GI network. | | General and Funding | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901487 | | RESIDENT | LP20152264 | I am writing with regard to the article featured in the last "Our North Tyneside" issue about the Local Plan consultation, which just closed at the end of March. I would like to enquire about the plans for improving internet connections in the areas of Meadow Vale developments. I am a resident there who just moved in recently. I am very disappointed about the internet connection bandwidth - the upper limit is incredibly low (not higher than 3-4 Mbps) due to the fact that the nearest exchange is located in Killingworth. Considering there are plans to build new developments close to A19/pub Pavilion area, I would like to feed to the Planning Team the need to expand internet capabilities in the | | Telecommunications Broadband, mobile phone masts and equipment | Access to high speed broadband connections are of increasing importance to both businesses and residents, as the opportunities presented by the technology continue to expand. However, some areas of North Tyneside currently have only limited broadband connectivity whilst new developments rarely take full advantage of the potential to include complete fibre-optic broadband connectivity. The Government has set a target of achieving superfast broadband services to 90% of the country by 2015, with the remaining 10% provided with at least 2mbps. The Council's role in achieving this Government target is to help facilitate the | None required. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | area. With hundreds of new families and people joining the area, the current bandwidth will no longer be sufficient. Especially for businesses and people working from home, it is not acceptable to live in new development where internet connection is even slower than many developing countries. I hope the Planning Team will take this back and action appropriately. Thanks very much for your time. Looking forward to hearing from you with news. | | | delivery of superfast broadband services by the private sector providers at the local level in areas where market conditions or geographic location mean that the private sector is not likely to deliver this objective. The Council will continue work with broadband providers to achieve the widest rollout of their infrastructure development and to achieve the best outcomes for residents of North Tyneside. | |
| 594611 | National Grid | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015404 | National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customer. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets. National Grid infrastructure within North Tyneside Council's administrative area Electricity Transmission National Grid has two | | Telecommunications Broadband, mobile phone masts and equipment | Comments noted. National Grid details are on our consultation data base. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>high voltage overhead lines and six underground cables (listed below) within North Tyneside Council's administrative area. These form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. Line Ref. Description ZZA line 275 kV route from Blyth substation in Northumberland to South Shields substation in South Tyneside via Tynemouth substation in North Tyneside XF line 275 kV route from Blyth substation in Northumberland to Stella West substation in Gateshead Underground Cables 6 no. underground cables running from running from Tynemouth substation in North Tyneside to Silverlink substation in North Tyneside The following substation is also located within the administrative area of North Tyneside: Tynemouth 275kV, 132kV and 11kV substation Silverlink 11 kV substation National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity transmission assets via the following internet link: http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/ Gas Transmission National Grid has no high pressure gas transmission pipelines within the administrative area of North Tyneside Council. Electricity and Gas Distribution Northern Gas Networks owns and operates the gas distribution network in the North Tyneside Council administrative area whilst Northern Power Grid owns and operates the electricity distribution network. Contact details for the distribution operators can be found at</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>www.energynetworks.org Appendix - National Grid Assets Please find attached in: Appendix 1 maps of the sites referenced above in relation to the affected National Grid Transmission assets outlined above. Further Advice National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. In addition the following publications are available from the National Grid website or by contacting us at the address overleaf: i,§ National Grid's commitments when undertaking works in the UK - our stakeholder, community and amenity policy; i,§ Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations - Requirements for Third Parties; and i,§ A sense of place - design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines. i,§ T/SP/SSW22 "" Specification for safe working in the vicinity of National Grid high pressure gas pipelines and associated installations "" requirements for third parties. http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=33968 Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database:</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| 830652 | | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015786 | <p>Thank you for your recent consultation on the above and taking the time to seek the Mobile Operators Association's views on the emerging Local Plan. We consider this a very proactive approach to forward planning and welcome the opportunity to have input in the process. It is recognised that telecommunications plays a vital role in both the economic and social fabric of communities. National guidance recognises this through Section 5: "Supporting high quality communications infrastructure" of National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) which provides clear guidance as to the main issues surrounding telecommunications development. Paragraph 42 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) confirms that; "advanced, high quality communications infrastructure is essential for sustainable economic growth" and that it "plays a vital role in enhancing the provision of local community facilities and services". Further advice on the siting and design of telecommunications and good practice procedural guidance is contained within the Code of Best Practice for Mobile Phone Network Development (July 2013). This builds on the Ten Commitments to ensure that the industry is alive to the concerns of local communities and consultation is built into the development process. While we support the inclusion of a telecommunications policy within the emerging Local Plan, we have the following concerns about the wording of Policy DM10.14: Telecommunications "Broadband, mobile phone masts and</p> | | <p>Telecommunications "" Broadband, mobile phone masts and equipment</p> | <p>Comments noted. Sentence has been removed from paragraph.</p> | <p>Amendments actioned.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | equipment" and its supporting paragraphs: Paragraph 10.78 Paragraph 10.78 of the North Tyneside Local Plan Consultation 2015 states that more detailed advice relating to telecommunications equipment can be found in the Council's Planning Advice Note on Telecommunications. As detailed in the attached representation dated 05 February 2013, we have significant concerns about the advice provided in the Council's Planning Advice Note on Telecommunications and do not consider it to be in accordance with National Policy and Guidance. On that basis, we request that the reference to the Council's Planning Advice Note on Telecommunications is removed from paragraph 10.78 of the Local Plan Consultation . | | | | |
| 805689 | | | LP2015899 | Completely agreed that this is the way forward on waste management. However, your current processes for waste management are back-firing massively in some respects and North Tyneside currently looks like a giant landfill site. This litter epidemic has got to be addressed if anyone is going to start taking you seriously in respect of your plans for the area. Win yourself some friends and show your leadership and commitment to cleaning up our environment. There will be loads of disgruntled residents like me, but generally people don't have a clue where to start tackling a problem like this and need to be shown leadership and example. | | Waste Management | Comments noted. The Planning system primarily deals with the built environment. The Local Plan contains a policy to ensure that new developments Provide sustainable waste management (during construction and use) through the provision of recycling facilities and ensure a suitable location for the storage and collection of waste" (policy DM7.9 New development and waste) . The Local Plan also has to include policies on the facilities and land associated with waste management, which we acknowledge your support of. However the Local Plan or Planning system are otherwise not able to manage litter. The Council have a Streetcare team who deal with litter issues and they are aware of your concerns. Residents are encouraged to report issues by calling the team or via an online form: | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/403/report-untidy-streets-and-overflowing-litter-bins | |
| 424278 | SITA Up | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20151551 | The text in paragraph 10.63 refers to the percentage of municipal waste which is not recycled and is still sent to landfill. SITA UK would question whether this would be more accurately referred to as waste which is not recycled or recovered. Paragraph 10.67 still refers to "a waste energy plant" on Teesside and SITA UK would like to suggest that this is amended to "'energy from waste plant' in order to be consistent with commonly used terminology. Paragraph 10.67 states that the Urban Mines study confirms that there is sufficient capacity to manage and treat residual waste until 2030. However, this scenario was based upon the continued operation of Houghton Landfill in Sunderland, which has now been granted planning permission for a low level restoration to facilitate the development of an employment park. There is therefore a potential landfill capacity shortfall within the plan period and this should be recognised in the Local Plan. | | Waste Management | Thank you for your comments, amendments have been made. | Altered to read "Although waste which is not recycled or recovered continues to be sent to landfill, this was below 10% in 2013/14." Reference changed to "energy from waste plant" on Teesside. Paragraph about landfill capacity has been altered to read "Houghton Landfill in Sunderland has closed, the impact of this could produce an overall regional landfill capacity shortfall in the medium term, unless increased recycling and diversion targets are delivered. This will continue to be monitored at a regional level." |
| 396412 | Northumberland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015549 | Neither is it apparent that any current or potential flood attenuation measures have been adequately considered or identified in the plan. | | Water Management | Flood Risk Assessments will be carried out for all major developments. Two early assessments have been carried out for Murton and Killingworth Moor to assist with masterplanning, surface water separation (SuDS) has been considered within a flood risk assessment. | No amendments proposed. |
| 805543 | | | LP20151089 | The council have completely ignored the real and present danger of flooding in North Tyneside. The vast increase in proposed housing will flood Wallsend on a monumental | | Water Management | The Council have considered flood risk across North Tyneside and it's partners in the Environment Agency and Northumbrian Water have also been fully involved in the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | scale. | | | production of the Plan. Both National and local policy ensure that development will not increase the risk of flooding in the Borough. | |
| 803900 | Northumberland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151538 | Howdon Sewerage Treatment Works "" paragraph 10.57 The Council welcomes and supports the reference to ongoing joint work between Northumbrian Water Ltd, neighbouring Local Authority partners and the Environment Agency to control and minimise surface water flows, including investment in solutions to remove existing surface water from the public sewerage system to reduce the amount of water being processed at Howdon Sewage Treatment Works, This will help to ensure there is capacity at Howdon Sewerage Treatment Works to support future growth. | | Water Management | Comment noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151789 | As you will be aware, NWL has a vested interest in specific aspects of the LPCD and how it relates to other emerging policy and guidance on the subject of sustainable water and drainage management. We note the timing of this consultation document in relation to the announcement of the planned next steps for new Government guidance on 'Delivering Sustainable Drainage Systems' (dated 18th December 2014) by DEFRA and DCLG which will be brought into effect on 15th April 2015 and we are interested to ascertain if and how you have been able to demonstrate cognisance of this emerging guidance as a result of the 2008 Pitt Review. | | Water Management | Comment noted, new guidance has now been embedded into the Plan and NWL have been re-consulted, and are happy with, amendments | Changes made to the surrounded text in Chapter 8 to reflect the changes made on April 15th. |
| | | | LP20152230 | Real problem with flooding the farmers field already has a water tank which we had to fight for. Mineshafts under farmers field | | Water Management | Comment Noted | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| 899194 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | | LP20151651 | NWL acknowledge that appropriate infrastructure is delivered in the right place and at the right time. However NWL suggest Policy S1 0.1 is reworded to align more closely with paragraphs 203- 206 of the NPPF. In particular it should reflect the fact that obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition, and should conform to the planning obligation test as set out in paragraph 204 of the NPPF. In assessing the level of contributions that can be made it is important that developments are not pushed towards the margins of viability and NWL recommend that this issue is highlighted within the wording of the policy. | | S 10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding | Comment noted. It is necessary to ensure that there is enough infrastructure to support new development. This should be in line with national policy and legislation. The policy will be updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding. The Council is using an appropriate methodology to investigate viability within North Tyneside. | The policy has been updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding as well as alignment with the NPPF. |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151739 | 55. Whilst there have been some subtle changes to the policy our previous comments upon this policy remain. 56. Part "a" of the policy seeks to remove any existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision. The Council will be aware of the intention to scale back the use of Section 106 contributions from April 2015 onwards. It is therefore likely that most such improvements to deficiencies in existing infrastructure provision will need to be dealt with through CIL contributions. 57. The policy also seeks to maximise contributions from developers. In assessing the level of contributions that can be made it is important that developments are not pushed towards the margins of viability. Indeed the Harmon guidance recommends local authorities take a cautious approach and include a viability cushion to ensure that development can proceed. | | S 10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding | Comment noted. It is necessary to ensure that there is enough infrastructure to support new development. This should be in line with national policy and legislation. The policy will be updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding. The Council is using an appropriate methodology to investigate viability within North Tyneside. | The policy has been updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding as well as alignment with the NPPF. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| 769763 | Bellway Homes (NE) | DEVELOPER | LP20151929 | Bellway suggest Policy S/1 0.1 is reworded to align more closely with paragraphs 203-206 of the NPPF. In particular, the Policy should reflect the fact that obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition, and should conform to the planning obligation test as set out in paragraph 204 of the NPPF. | | S 10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding | Comment noted. It is necessary to ensure that there is enough infrastructure to support new development. This should be in line with national policy and legislation. The policy will be updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding. | The policy has been updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding as well as alignment with the NPPF. |
| 900788 | | DEVELOPER | LP20151995 | Our Client acknowledges the need to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is delivered in the right place and at the right time. Our Client supports the revision of Policy S 10.1 to reference the use of conditions to obtain contributions from developers, along with planning obligations and other means including a Community Infrastructure Levy. However, the Policy should be reworded to clearly reflect that obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition. This would ensure consistency with paragraphs 203 to 206 of the NPPF. | | S 10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding | Comment noted. It is necessary to ensure that there is enough infrastructure to support new development. This should be in line with national policy and legislation. The policy will be updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding. It is not considered necessary to repeat current policy and legislation. | The policy has been updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding as well as alignment with the NPPF. |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152012 | The consortium considers that Policy S10.1 should be better aligned with NPPF paragraph 32 regarding the delivery of infrastructure (particularly in respect to Highways and Transportation) and in particular the aspiration of Policy S10.1 criterion (a) to remove any existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision. Removing deficiencies in infrastructure which are less than severe may not always be the most efficient use of resources. If CIL is introduced it would enable new infrastructure improvements which yielded more substantial | | S 10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding | Comment noted. It is necessary to ensure that there is enough infrastructure to support new development. This should be in line with national policy and legislation. The policy will be updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding. It is not considered necessary to repeat current policy and legislation. | The policy has been updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding as well as alignment with the NPPF. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|---|
| | | | | benefits that seeking to remedy existing deficiencies which are not severe. | | | | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152052 | Policy SI10.1 is supported in principle. No further comment can be given until a CIL viability and Charging Schedule are produced for comment. | | S 10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901136 | | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20152065 | We would appreciate further dialogue to ensure that currently identified and future cross boundary infrastructure has been satisfactorily addressed through the plan preparation and policy framework. Recent Duty to Co-operate statements in the Gateshead and Newcastle Joint Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan (EL 09 Compliance Statement) outline likely cross boundary matters for example, education capacity identified in North Tyneside schools to serve the Hazlerigg and Wideopen sites located in Newcastle. These statements remain in place and we are happy to have further discussions on education provision. Joint working between the authorities and Northumbrian Water Limited has indicated the need for regular monitoring of Howdon Sewage Treatment Works and Tyneside Interceptor Asset Management Plan, to ensure future improvements to the facility continues to serve development in Tyne and Wear authorities as included in Infrastructure Delivery Plans. | | S 10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding | Comment noted. We will continue to work with neighbouring authorities in line with duty to co-operate requirements. | No amendments proposed. |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP20152079 | RE New Site: Russell Square Our Client acknowledges the need to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is delivered in the right place and at the right time. Our Client supports the revision of Policy S10.1 to reference the use of conditions to obtain | | S 10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding | Comment noted. It is necessary to ensure that there is enough infrastructure to support new development. This should be in line with national policy and legislation. The policy will be updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its | The policy has been updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding as well as |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | contributions from developers, along with planning obligations and other means including a Community Infrastructure Levy. However, our Client suggests that the Policy is further reworded to clearly reflect that obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition. This would ensure consistency with paragraphs 203 to 206 of the NPPF. | | | funding. It is not considered necessary to repeat current policy and legislation. | alignment with the NPPF. |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152098 | RE New Site: Land to rear of Front Street, Seaton Burn. Our Client acknowledges the need to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is delivered in the right place and at the right time. Our Client supports the revision of Policy S10.1 to reference the use of conditions to obtain contributions from developers, along with planning obligations and other means including a Community Infrastructure Levy. However, our Client suggests that the Policy is further reworded to clearly reflect that obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition. This would ensure consistency with paragraphs 203 to 206 of the NPPF. | | S 10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding | Comment noted. It is necessary to ensure that there is enough infrastructure to support new development. This should be in line with national policy and legislation. The policy will be updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding. It is not considered necessary to repeat current policy and legislation. | The policy has been updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding as well as alignment with the NPPF. |
| 807177 | Barmoor Ltd | LANDOWNE R / BUSINESS | LP20152141 | RE New Site: Land to the south of Meadow Drive, Seaton Burn. Our Client acknowledges the need to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is delivered in the right place and at the right time. Our Client supports the revision of Policy S10.1 to reference the use of conditions to obtain contributions from developers, along with planning obligations and other means including a Community Infrastructure Levy. However, our Client | | S 10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding | Comment noted. It is necessary to ensure that there is enough infrastructure to support new development. This should be in line with national policy and legislation. The policy will be updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding. It is not considered necessary to repeat current policy and legislation. | The policy has been updated to clarify the overall aims for infrastructure development and its funding as well as alignment with the NPPF. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | suggests that the Policy is further reworded to clearly reflect that obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition. This would ensure consistency with paragraphs 203 to 206 of the NPPF. | | | | |
| 879298 | | RESIDENT | LP201537 | Use the Coast Road as an open drain because that's where water collects as it can't get to the Tyne. | | DM 10.10 : Sustainable Drainage | Surface water management is a key issue for the Local Plan, both in terms of reducing and mitigating surface water flood risk and reducing the volume of surface water that currently flows in to Howdon Waste Water Treatment Works. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015466 | Finally, we wholly support Policies S10.9 and DM10.10 and their supporting text regarding the strategic need to invest in sustainably managing surface water, and thus waste water and sewage capacity at the Howdon Sewage Treatment Works, in order to ensure the headroom necessary to support future development in the cross-boundary catchment area. | | DM 10.10 : Sustainable Drainage | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151385 | Policy DM10:10 CPRE broadly supports this policy but urges that care must be taken to ensure that drainage provisions are sufficient to prevent harm. | | DM 10.10 : Sustainable Drainage | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 803900 | Northumberland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151539 | The policy currently makes reference to a SuDS Approving Body (SAB). However, the SABs are no longer being created and it is intended that the NPPF and its associated planning guidance will be strengthened in relation use of SuDS within new developments with the Lead Local Flood Authority now becoming a statutory consultee on major planning applications rather than the SAB. With this in mind consideration should be given to altering | | DM 10.10 : Sustainable Drainage | Comment noted, plan needs to be updated with to reflect new procedures and guidance | References SAB removed and Local Lead Flood Authority inserted |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | policy DM10.10 accordingly. | | | | |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151806 | <p>We strongly support the content of Policy DM10.10, which contains important guidance for developers regarding the disposal of surface water from development sites. The principles identified within Policy DM10.10 will ensure a proactive approach to the reduction of surface water and sewer flooding risk within North Tyneside and enable development to reduce existing surface water runoff rates. In particular, we welcome the strict approach to surface water disposal incorporated within the policy, whereby discharge directly to combined sewers will only be considered in exceptional circumstances. Having said this, we do believe that there are opportunities within Policy DM10.10 and its supporting text to promote the use of sustainable drainage systems to a greater degree. Once again, phrases such as "where practicable" are seen to threaten the overall approach to sustainable drainage within new development, which is otherwise sound in principle. Equally, it is our opinion that the language of DM10.10 should set sustainable drainage within a more positive context, with encouragement of surpassing post development runoff rate requirements, rather than meeting a minimum reduction to fulfil criteria. Furthermore, we believe that the structure of DM10.10 is slightly confused at present, with reference moving from sustainable surface water management to sustainable drainage systems without clear indication. We would suggest that the policy</p> | | DM 10.10 : Sustainable Drainage | RE: Confusion in policy wording, reorder Policy 10.10 to separate run off from SUDs, consider splitting into two. | <p>"Where practicable" has been removed. The two water sections have been combined into a Water Environment Section within chapter 8. Policy 10.10 has now been split into Policy DM5.14 Surface Water Run Off and Policy DM5.15 Sustainable Drainage</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>may first address sustainable surface water management, including post-development runoff rates, before focusing upon the incorporation of sustainable drainage systems as a means to achieve the required reduction in surface water runoff. Rearrangement of the policy in this manner would create the opportunity for further reference to be made to the design, features and mechanisms of sustainable drainage systems. Looking to the future, we would suggest that the policy should give recognition to the evolution of national sustainable drainage standards. In particular, SuDS NS5 of the guidance for the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage published in June 2014 proposes stricter guidelines for previously developed sites, suggesting that: "SuDS NS5. For developments which were previously developed, the peak runoff rate from the development to any drain, sewer or surface water body for the 1 in 1 year rainfall event and the 1 in 100 year rainfall event must be as close as reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff rate from the development for the same rainfall event, but must not exceed the rate of discharge from the development prior to redevelopment for that event." When the National Standards are adopted, planning policy will need to align with these stricter guidelines. In any event, we would advocate this stricter approach to minimise the risk of sewer flooding, and would urge the Council to consider this greater reduction in surface water run-off within at least the Council's "critical drainage areas".</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151828 | As outlined in 10.57 and the WCS there currently is insufficient capacity at Howdon Sewerage Treatment Works (HSTW) to accommodate the increased foul drainage from the planned housing and employment growth. NWL are currently working on a Sustainable Sewerage Strategy across Tyne and Wear which will help remove surface water from sewers. Although this will help increase capacity at HSTW this will not free up sufficient capacity to accommodate all planned growth. Surface water is seen as both the problem and a solution to freeing up capacity at HSTW and enabling sustainable growth. The key to increasing capacity would be to take surface water out of the sewerage network - on this basis, we recommend that the policy reflects these requirements. In removing surface water from the sewer network careful consideration must be given to ensure that surface water does not increase flood risk elsewhere. On this basis, the requirement of "no net increase" may not be sufficiently reflect these issues. DM 10.10 seeks to limit post development run off rates to a maximum of 50% of the flows. We consider cross referencing of these policies is required to avoid confusion. | | DM 10.10 : Sustainable Drainage | Flood policies have been reworked so that they are now all listed together in the plan in the Natural Environment section. This now links development and flooding, flood reduction, surface water run off and sustainable drainage in one section. Reference to "no net increase" has been removed from the reworked flood policies. | The two water sections have been combined into a Water Environment Section within chapter 8. |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151828 | You will know that the Government has announced that it intends to change our statutory consultee duties for planning applications. This also means making Lead Local Flood Authorities statutory consultees for surface water drainage issues for "major" developments. This will need a change to the Development Management Procedure Order | | DM 10.10 : Sustainable Drainage | Thank you for the information, the water section will be updated following the updates to the DMPO and the PPG. The national SuDS Design Guide and a Regional Guide will provide more detail for SuDS. The Council is also considering an SPD for use by the Planning team and the LLFA | References SAB removed and Local Lead Flood Authority inserted |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>(DMPO). A new DMPO which includes these changes and consolidates the original DMPO and amendments made to it was recently published and will come into force on 15th April 2015. To support the new consultation arrangements, DCLG has changed the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The main changes are to the pages: Why are sustainable drainage systems important? How the local planning authority should involve the lead local flood authority when determining planning applications and what advice should be given about local flood risks Water supply , wastewater and water quality considerations in plan-making This guidance provides clarity on when SUDs are appropriate, together with minimum standards of operation and the need that there are clear arrangements in place for ongoing maintenance. On this basis, we consider it is essential that the Policy outlines the LPA's position and expectations "" particularly regarding maintenance and adoption of SUDS. The PPG further highlights that SUDs provide opportunities to: "ç reduce the causes and impacts of flooding; "ç remove pollutants from urban run-off at source; "ç combine water management with green space with benefits for amenity, recreation and wildlife. Given this emphasis of the wider benefits of flood risk, we consider that this policy can be strengthened to highlight the water quality, amenity, recreation and wildlife benefits. As previously highlighted a number of recent planning applications have proposed direct deep drainage discharges of surface</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | water to the bedrock. | | | | |
| 396324 | Newcastle Airport | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151839 | As outlined in previous submissions, under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites And Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002, NIAL is a statutory Consultee for certain types of development. Of particular interest in relation to this plan, are bird attracting environments such as Sustainable Urban Drainage ponds (SUDS) and bird attracting landscaping. Within 13 kilometres of an aerodrome, bird strike is a significant issue for departing and arriving aircraft. Within this plan, reference should be made to NIA's obligations in relation to SUDS ponds and wetland creation as a form of surface water management to reduce localised flooding. | | DM 10.10 : Sustainable Drainage | Add some information in the surrounding text about the airport and potential restrictions | Added a sentence to the supporting text around the policy which discusses local land conditions and constraints. "The Borough's proximity to Newcastle Airport also means that care should be taken with open water and other and bird attracting landscaping. Bird Strike is a significant issue for aircraft and as such Newcastle Airport is a statutory consultee for many applications including those with such landscaping." |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152049 | Sub criteria (d) (From Policy DM9.1) require the use of SUDS as part of an approach to reduce surface water run off. This links with policy DM10.10 to which we have the following concerns: The policy requires the inclusion of drainage systems which at present the Council are unwilling to adopt leading to a requirement for onsite management and additional developer cost. As we have stated previously we cannot at present comment on strategic viability as non has been provided however the cumulative cost of development is of principle concern in this regard. With the above in mind we object to this policy and advise the Council consider the impact of adoption / non adoption | | DM 10.10 : Sustainable Drainage | The requirement for Sustainable Drainage to ensure sites address issues of flood risk and water quality are integral to ensuring sustainable development as required within the National Planning Policy Framework and wider national legislation. The policy proposed by the Council sets out requirements in accordance with the advice of Northumbrian Water and the Environment Agency. Whether the Local Authority were to adopt SuDS or a 3rd party management regime is required, costs will arise for construction and maintenance that would be recovered through the development and contributions from householders on the site. The potential | Policy has been altered but no amendments proposed in relation to this comment. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | approaches through its SVA (Strategic Viability Assessment). | | | impacts upon the viability of development from the construction of SuDS is therefore recognised, but is likely to arise irrespective of any future maintenance regime. Work on an Area Wide Viability Assessment is underway and will be published for consultation alongside the pre-submission draft. As reflected through policy for securing viable development and infrastructure provision - where local plan policy requirements cause issues of viability alternative approaches to ensure development can proceed will be explored - reflecting the relative importance of ensuring adequate solutions are in place to any issues of drainage and flood risk. | |
| 890843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015160 | Applaud recycling efforts! | | S 10.11 Waste Management | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396412 | Northumb erland Wildlife Trust | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATI ON | LP2015548 | We are also aware that the North Tyneside Sustainable Sewage Study is looking at the sewage capacity across the borough in light of Howden Treatment Works being at capacity. We have concerns that some of these allocations may not be sustainable in-light of this. This statement remains current. | | S 10.11 Waste Management | Comment noted. The Council are working with Northumbria Water to ensure that the levels of growth outlined will be deliverable based on their understanding of available capacity at Howdon. | No amendments proposed. |
| 803900 | Northumb erland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151540 | Policy S.10.11 "" Locational criteria The policy criteria to guide the location of new or enhanced waste management facilities are supported. Policy S.10.11 "" Tonnages of waste requiring management In the County Council's response to the 2013 Consultation Local Plan we made comments regarding the need for the supporting text to identify the tonnages of municipal and commercial and industrial waste requiring management in North Tyneside over the plan period. It is | | S 10.11 Waste Management | Agree | Deleted criterion E |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | noted that additional text has been added to address our comments and the additional text is supported. Policy S.10.11 "" Criterion e It is unclear what the rationale and justification for the criterion is and how it would be applied to any developments that may come forward for new or enhanced waste management facilities in North Tyneside over the plan period. It is acknowledged that suitable unutilised capacity may exist outside of North Tyneside and that some waste facilities need to serve catchments large enough to make them economically viable but this should not prevent proposals for new or enhanced waste management capacity in North Tyneside being looked upon negatively. It is considered that this criterion should either be deleted from the policy or amended to address these concerns. | | | | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151964 | Natural England supports this policy. | | S 10.11 Waste Management | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 805689 | | | LP2015900 | SITA. This is the organisation with the huge wagons that carry waste from our region elsewhere - at the same time scattering rubbish into our roads and verges their entire journey. I've seen it happen countless times and so has my partner. The sheer amount of litter around today is not simply down to people throwing things from cars. It's obvious by the sheer diversity of the litter that it has originally come from household bins. It's bad enough that some of our weekly collectors leave litter on the pavements sometimes (I expect because they're under a lot of time pressure), but our main roadsides are absolutely appalling. Our waste management | | DM 10.12 Protection of Waste Facilities | Comments noted. The Planning system primarily deals with the built environment. The Local Plan contains a policy to ensure that new developments "Provide sustainable waste management (during construction and use) through the provision of recycling facilities and ensure a suitable location for the storage and collection of waste (policy DM7.9 New development and waste). However the Local Plan or Planning system are otherwise not able to manage litter. The Local Plan also has to include policies on the facilities and land associated with waste management. But is unable to control the tidiness of the waste facility. The | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | facility site is a disgrace. Ourselves and 2 sets of neighbours have all very recently had punctures after visiting the site. The nearby roundabout and the land adjacent to the site is heavily littered and gives completely the wrong message to residents. 'If the Council don't care - why should we?' The waste management facility at Hexham is an excellent example of a clean, pleasant and inviting facility that encourages residents to participate in recycling - without a £10 bill for mending a puncture afterwards. | | | Council have a Streetcare team who deal with litter issues and they are aware of your concerns. Residents are encouraged to report issues by calling the team or via an online form: http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/403/report-untidy-streets-and-overflowing-litter-bins | |
| 803900 | Northumberland County Council | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20151541 | Policy DM.10.12 "" New development close to existing waste facilities In the County Council's response to the 2013 Consultation Local Plan we made comments regarding the need to recognise the impact that incompatible development in close proximity to an existing waste site would have on the current and future operation of that site. It is noted that additional text has been added to this policy to deal with the issue raised and the amended policy wording is supported. | | DM 10.12 Protection of Waste Facilities | support noted | No amendments proposed |
| 891832 | | RESIDENT | LP2015211 | I am delighted that North Tyneside is about to rebuild Marden High School. It would seem sensible therefore to do everything possible to ensure that it had sufficient students to secure the financial stability of the school in the future. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 891852 | | RESIDENT | LP2015213 | I got the proposals about improving the area and building new homes yesterday at Killingworth through the post but I would like the local council to also ensure that those who have moved to this area on the promise of first class facilities to raise a family are remembered and not just left in a `that will | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan sets out in its vision that it wishes to ensure that North Tyneside is a place of opportunity, prosperity and vibrancy with excellent access to education and training facilities to achieve their full potential and easy access to open space, leisure and recreational | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | do` scenario. | | | facilities. It is vital to listen to the views of the public and stakeholders who have a keen awareness of the local area, alongside national legislation and guidance to ensure that the best possible scenario can be delivered for North Tyneside rather than a 'that will do' scenario. | |
| 630486 | | | LP2015281 | Please take into serious consideration - real people live in houses - don't make the classic mistake of planning clever estates without thinking of people of all ages. Having amenities such as shops, community centres etc. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of shops and community centres and other local community infrastructure is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10). The policies and the evidence that supports some of the policies will be monitored and updated over the Local Period to ensure the aims and objectives of the Local Plan are being implemented Policy S11.1, (now Policy 9.1). | No amendments proposed. |
| 814591 | | | LP2015352 | Local health providers are already stretched to meet the targets imposed, are they to be increased/ And schooling? will the classroom sizes become too huge to teach? | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of health facilities and schools is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The policies and the evidence that supports some of the policies will be monitored and updated over the Local Period to ensure the aims and objectives of the Local Plan are being implemented Policy S11.1, (now policy S9.1). Through these policies the Council states how it will respond to infrastructure provision (such as | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | education and health) so that it delivers the infrastructure required to make new development acceptable and, meet other anticipated future infrastructure needs. | |
| 893913 | | | LP2015415 | I have the following concerns: Increased capacity on local services. Hospitals, Doctors, Dentists Schools. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of health facilities and schools is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.9) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The policies and the evidence that supports some of the policies will be monitored and updated over the Local Period to ensure the aims and objectives of the Local Plan are being implemented Policy S11.1, (now policy S9.1). Through these policies the Council states how it will respond to infrastructure provision (such as education and health) so that it delivers the infrastructure required to make new development acceptable and meet other anticipated future infrastructure needs. | No amendments proposed. |
| 895180 | | RESIDENT | LP2015514 | If housing is increased where are the extra schools provision? | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of future infrastructure such as schools is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy 7.1). The policies and the evidence that supports some of the policies will be monitored and updated over the Local Period to ensure the aims and objectives of the Local Plan are | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | being implemented Policy S11.1, (now Policy S9.1). Through these policies the Council states how it will deliver the infrastructure required to make new development acceptable and, meet other anticipated future infrastructure needs. | |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP2015701 | Schools in Killingworth area already full, surplus school places in North West area. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of school places is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary and secondary school to meet the needs of the future populations at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | No amendments proposed. |
| 806113 | | RESIDENT | LP2015768 | As public affairs and pub preservation officer I thank you on behalf of the Tyneside and Northumberland branch of CAMRA (Campaign for Real Ale) for the opportunity to comment on the proposed local plan consultation for North Tyneside. Our concern is for the survival of public houses and here in particular community pubs. Unfortunately we were unable to find any reference in the how the council is proposing to safeguard the future of community pubs in North Tyneside. That said, words in itself cannot save pubs. You need to spell out in your local plan how you wish to safeguard the future of community pubs. You could make reference | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan sets out the importance of community facilities in the Local Plan in Policy S10.13 (now Policy S7.9). This Policy covers pubs and these are recognised as an important part of providing for local communities needs and achieving community cohesion. Policy S10.13 (now Policy S7.9) does state that where land or buildings used as community facilities are deemed surplus to requirements, priority should be given to alternative community uses with a set of criteria to be applied. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | to being prepared to use article 4 legislation to protect community pubs pro-actively against planning applications against the wishes of the local community.. | | | | |
| 898219 | | | LP2015819 | Don't forget to make any builder who gets planning permission build medical centres and schools which are usually forgotten. They only seem to think about how many houses they can squeeze into the plot. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The importance of health and education facilities is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers and NHS England to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary and secondary school to meet the needs of the future populations at Killingworth Moor and Murton, plus additional health facilities. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151011 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy 7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy 7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151027 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy 7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy 7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 856633 | Theatres Trust | | LP20151046 | The Theatres Trust is pleased with the amendments to this policy. It now much more clearly aims to protect and enhance existing community and cultural facilities while also encouraging the provision of new facilities. This better reflects guidance found in the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 123, seeking provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure, and especially at paragraph 70 which states that to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; and guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151108 | Green Party We support this policy but are doubtful that it can be delivered for the major housing developments envisaged while still maintaining and enhancing the natural environment and biodiversity the Plan also commits to. We are concerned that the environment will be sacrificed to the demands of housing developers and economic growth, while concerns about climate change will be jettisoned in favour of short term and unsustainable objectives. We would like to see community design accompanying a | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. Policy S10.13 (now S7.10) seeks to support community facilities that help contribute towards building sustainable communities. The Local Plan outlines the Councils approach to achieve sustainable development in the Borough and Policy S1.1, balancing the requirements for growth with the challenges of climate change. The Local Plan also has policies that focus on the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | community infrastructure which favours social inclusion and minimises the disadvantages of people who are the most vulnerable " the young, old, disabled " ". All of us at some time in our lives. | | | protection, extension, enhancement and creation of green infrastructure in the Borough within Chapter 8. | |
| 685823 | North Tyneside Green Party | | LP20151109 | Green Party We support this policy but are doubtful that it can be delivered for the major housing developments envisaged while still maintaining and enhancing the natural environment and biodiversity the Plan also commits to. We are concerned that the environment will be sacrificed to the demands of housing developers and economic growth, while concerns about climate change will be jettisoned in favour of short term and unsustainable objectives. We would like to see community design accompanying a community infrastructure which favours social inclusion and minimises the disadvantages of people who are the most vulnerable " the young, old, disabled " ". All of us at some time in our lives. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. Policy S10.13 (now S7.10) seeks to support community facilities that help contribute towards building sustainable communities. The Local Plan outlines the Councils approach to achieve sustainable development in the Borough and Policy S1.1, balancing the requirements for growth with the challenges of climate change. The Local Plan also has policies that focus on the protection, extension, enhancement and creation of green infrastructure in the Borough within chapter 8. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151137 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151161 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151169 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151183 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151197 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151226 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/OR | LP20151393 | Policy S10:13 Community infrastructure. CPRE supports this policy. | | S 10.13 Community | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | GANISATION | | | | Infrastructure | | |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151420 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151438 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151458 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy 7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151563 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | No amendments proposed. |
| 900011 | | RESIDENT | LP20151595 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | | over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151621 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151665 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy 7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151966 | Natural England supports this policy. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 901563 | | RESIDENT | LP20152377 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901564 | | RESIDENT | LP20152394 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | are made available before the homes are built. | | | outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 901558 | | RESIDENT | LP20152411 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 901560 | | RESIDENT | LP20152412 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.13 Community Infrastructure | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' (now Policy S7.10) and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding' (now Policy S7.1). The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | and Murton. | |
| 830652 | | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015799 | <p>Policy DM10.14 "" Criterion (c) Criterion (c) of Policy DM10.14 states that applications will be permitted where there are no satisfactory alternative sites available. In some instances it is possible for more than one "satisfactory" site/option for the installation of telecommunications equipment to be available and in those cases a choice is made between the "satisfactory" options available. On that basis, it would not be reasonable for an application to be refused on the basis that other "satisfactory" alternative options are available, when the option being progressed is also considered to be "satisfactory". In order to avoid ambiguity we would suggest that the wording for criterion (c) of Policy DM10.14 is amended as follows: "There are no more satisfactory alternative sites for telecommunications available". Policy DM10.14 Criterion (d) of Policy DM10.14 requires that there is a justifiable need for a new telecommunications site however paragraph 46 of NPPF states that Local planning authorities should not, "question the need for the telecommunications system". On that basis, we request that criterion (d) of Policy DM10.14 is deleted. Summary In summary, while we support the inclusion of Policy DM10.14 within the emerging Local Plan, we consider that the criteria detailed above are overly restrictive to telecommunications developments and contrary to the provisions of National Policy and Guidance. We therefore recommend that</p> | | DM 10.14 Telecommunications Broadband, mobile phone masts and equipment | <p>Comment noted. The suggested amendments have been considered and the suggested changes of Policy DM10.14 (now Policy DM7.10) have been incorporated into large parts of the existing policy. Some elements have not changed and criteria (d) has been retained as it is a reflection of NPPF para 43, which does not question the need for telecommunications systems but the need for a new telecommunications site to be justified.</p> | <p>New Policy criteria below:</p> <p>a. If proposing a new mast, evidence should demonstrate that no reasonable possibilities exist of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures.</p> <p>b. The siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity and respect the character or appearance of the surrounding area</p> <p>c. If sited on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building</p> <p>d. The development should not have an unacceptable adverse impact on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest. When considering applications</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>the wording is amended as suggested above. As an alternative to the amendments suggested above, another option would be to substitute the existing wording of Policy DM10.14 with the following wording: "Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met: - (I) the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area; (ii) if on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building; (iii) if proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the (local) planning authority. (iv) If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest. When considering applications for telecommunications development, the (local) planning authority will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks and the technical limitations of the technology". We trust you find the above comments of</p> | | | | <p>for telecommunications development, the Council will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks.</p> <p>e. There are no more satisfactory alternative sites for telecommunications available.</p> <p>f. There is a justifiable need for a new site.</p> <p>g. Proposals subject to government guidelines on non-ionising radiation protection are accompanied by an International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection certificate.</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | assistance. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries relating to the above matters. | | | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152190 | Policy DM 10.14 -as with preceding policies governing renewable energy, water and waste management, drainage, and telecommunications, development should be resisted where it would lead to unjustified harm to the historic environment. | | DM 10.14 Telecommunications Broadband, mobile phone masts and equipment | Agreed. It is considered that the provisions within the relevant heritage asset policies and the NPPF will allow for appropriate protection. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151965 | Natural England supports this policy. | | DM 10.14 Telecommunications "" Broadband, mobile phone masts and equipment | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 898920 | Sustrans | | LP2015986 | Sustrans are concerned that this policy has potential to impinge on the rights of children to travel safely to school in the borough by failing to secure adequate links between new residential development and schools or failing to mitigate the impact of new development on the existing road network. | | DM 10.2 Development Viability | Comment noted. Policy DM10.2 (now DM7.2) will work with other policies, such as S10.1 (now S7.1) and S10.3 (now S7.3), to ensure that required improvements to the road network are delivered as part of a new development. The policy will provide an opportunity to work with developers to ensure that viability issues will not prevent necessary infrastructure from being delivered. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151384 | Policy DM10:2.Development viability. While this policy is in line with NPPF, CPRE argues that if infrastructure required to make a development sustainable cannot be met from developer contributions, then the development is not really viable in the broader sense. Para 10.10 It would be useful to mention in this para the element of CIL which is payable to Neighbourhood Plan | | DM 10.2 Development Viability | Comment noted. Policy DM10.2 (now DM7.2) will be used to ensure that developer contributions are established to take into account developer viability. If developer contributions are unable to resolve planning issues then the development could be considered as not acceptable. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | communities and the potential local benefits. | | | | |
| 755686 | Home Builders Federation | | LP20151740 | 58. The HBF is generally supportive of this policy and the amendments from the previous consultation on the plan which largely reflect our previous comments. It is, however, recommended that further clarity be provided in respect of criterion ii and how this would work in practice. | | DM 10.2 Development Viability | Support noted. The suggested amendment has been considered and policy DM10.2 (now Policy DM7.2) has been updated accordingly. | Policy DM10.2 (now Policy DM7.2) has been amended for further clarity. Point b now reads as follows: "Consider alternative phasing, through the development period, of any contributions where to do so would sufficiently improve the economic viability of the scheme to enable payment." |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151961 | Should a situation arise where a developer can no longer make infrastructure payments, this should not affect any mitigation required for development that has potential to affect Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar needed to comply with policy DM8.6 Management of International Sites. | | DM 10.2 Development Viability | Comment noted. Policy DM10.2 (now DM7.2) will work with other policies to ensure that required mitigation is delivered. The policy will provide an opportunity to work with developers to ensure that financial issues will not prevent necessary mitigation from being delivered. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152010 | The consortium supports the policy because it acknowledges the role of viability in achieving the overarching benefits of new development. It is reasonable to consider deferral of payments as an alternative to exemption but in the spirit of the policy as a whole it is important to understand that deferral may not always achieve viability which will normally be viewed over the whole life of a project in any event. | | DM 10.2 Development Viability | Support noted. It is accepted that deferring a payment may not always provide a solution when addressing viability. Policy DM10.2 has been amended and also makes references to phased payments as an alternative. | Policy DM10.2 has been amended and the text reads as follows: " In these circumstances the Council may: a. Enter negotiations with the applicant over a suitable contribution towards the infrastructure costs of the proposed development, whilst continuing to enable viable and sustainable development; b. Consider alternative |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | phasing, through the development period, of any contributions where to do so would sufficiently improve the economic viability of the scheme to enable payment." |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152053 | Policy DM10.2 is also supported subject to the same reservations as highlighted above. | | DM 10.2 Development Viability | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152185 | Paragraph I 0.4 -subject to minor amendment, the historic environment would clearly be seen to be a legitimate recipient of Community Infrastructure Levy and Section I 06 monies where heritage assets would be impacted upon by development. | | DM 10.2 Development Viability | Comment noted, this will be amended. | Last bullet of para 10.4 (now para 10.6) now reads "secure protection and in particular enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, and the improvement of the image of the Borough." |
| 444604 | | RESIDENT | LP201586 | Please preserve the field paths routes for pedestrians and cyclists as these are vital for road safety in keeping people away from heavy-traffic-ed routes. OK, many field paths are not legally bridleways but they are well used by cyclists going to work and school. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan sets out its clear focus to deliver improved accessibility whilst also reducing carbon emissions, primarily by encouraging active travel - walking and cycling. Working with the Council and its partners the Local Plan will seek to provide safe convenient and accessible routes for pedestrians, cyclists, horse-riders and other non-motorised modes of transport, using green infrastructure links where appropriate. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890186 | | RESIDENT | LP201587 | Transport Links into the two major developments are totally inadequate to handle all the additional traffic that will be generated. The roads around Silverlink and Cobalt are already severely overloaded at 'rush hour' - this needs attention before further expansion | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel in the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Borough. I am presuming the two major developments referred to are Murton and Killingworth Moor. The transport links serving these two sites will need to be outlined in a transport and access strategy as part of the detailed master plans for each site. | |
| 890843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015159 | Support development of transport links - particularly A19/A1058. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 890843 | | RESIDENT | LP2015163 | I like the fill-in along the north loop of the Metro line. Sensible within other limitations. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 891830 | | RESIDENT | LP2015209 | I refer to housing development (proposed) situated on the east side of A190, with the NW corner adjacent to Sandy Lane roundabout. This even now is a well known bottleneck (I travel 2/3 times per week). The star of the plan indicated priority improvement. I don't have a problem with the housing development but suggest improvements NOW for the aforementioned roundabout. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed improvements to junctions indicated on the summary leaflet have been designed to reflect the levels of growth set out in the Local Plan, the overall aim to make it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. Further details of the design of the transport schemes will be publicised on the Council website when information is available. | No amendments proposed. |
| 464281 | | RESIDENT | LP2015248 | Standardised traffic calming is needed throughout the borough e.g. cushions rather than chicanes. Provision for cycle lanes is needed on all main roads. All main roads should have double yellow lines to prevent hold-up of traffic leaving estates. I am very concerned about the upgrading of traffic markings. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan does not cover the detail of traffic calming measures to be implemented in the Borough but this would be a detailed design issue, which the highways engineers would decide. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Policy S10.3 and Policy DM10.4 (now Policies S7.3 and DM7.4) aim to improve cycle routes through the Borough. If you have any further queries or problems regarding traffic management issues in North Tyneside, please telephone (0191) 643 6090 or (0191) 643 6121. | |
| 892201 | | RESIDENT | LP2015252 | Jobs and development are welcome, however what proposals exist for improving roads, paths and infrastructure? i.e. back lanes and side roads. Will the Local Plan address these questions? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Policy S10.3 'Transport' and Policy DM10.4 'New Development and Transport' (now Policies S7.3 and DM7.4) consider transport infrastructure from the large strategic issues (e.g. potential Metro extensions) down to footpaths and cycle way improvements that help ensure an integrated transport approach to travelling throughout the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 630486 | | | LP2015270 | RE Killingworth Avenue, Backworth - will the bus company improve? The areas have been left 'isolated' by the council / why no shops - usable buses before plans? Lived here since | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan does support a comprehensive, integrated and accessible public transport network by working with Nexus and bus operators. The | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | 1970s - bus service deplorable - council overlooked all complaints. | | | Local Plan seeks to deliver sustainable development but cannot force improvements on bus companies but I have passed your concerns on to the Councils transport team who have regular meetings with Nexus so they are aware of your concerns. It is hoped that through the Local Plan future developments will incorporate a integrated transport network connecting communities to facilities and services they need from the early design stages and not retrofitted once development has been built. | |
| 630486 | | | LP2015282 | Please take into serious consideration - traffic, congestion from new development. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed. |
| 892229 | | RESIDENT | LP2015287 | Concerns about traffic on Simonside Way, Killingworth | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed improvements to junctions indicated on the summary leaflet have been designed to reflect the levels of growth set out in the Local Plan, the overall aim to make it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. Further | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | details of the design of the transport schemes will be publicised on the Council website when information is available. | |
| 892866 | | RESIDENT | LP2015297 | Traffic! Speed and volume both already major issues on Killingworth Bank and West Lane. I'm woken up every morning by noise of traffic. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed improvements will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed. |
| 814591 | | | LP2015351 | Traffic on the coast and old coast road is horrendous at present so I dread to think what it'll be like with extra housing bearing in mind that 2 residents seem to bring 2 cars, is public transport likely to be able to cope? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Policy S10.3 'Transport' and Policy DM10.4 'New Development and Transport' (now Policoes S7.3 and DM7.4) consider transport infrastructure from the large strategic issues (e.g. potential Metro extensions) down to footpaths and cycle way improvements that help ensure an integrated transport approach to travelling throughout the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | LP2015364 | Bus services from Dudley and Annitsford to South East Northumberland need to be improved. Current routes - X21, X22, 2 - are not good enough and neither is the road infrastructure. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The routes and frequency of services of bus companies can be encouraged in the Local Plan (additional development may attract more frequent services or new services), but ultimately the bus company would determine the service in cooperation with NEXUS. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893904 | | RESIDENT | LP2015366 | Bringing extra roads into Sandy Lane will place extra pressure on the existing junctions at the Gosforth Park roundabout and also the roundabout approaching the A189, leading to Killingworth, north and south traffic. | | S 10.3 Transport | The suggested sites for housing and employment in the Local Plan have been considered in the transport modelling work for North Tyneside that has helped secure around £150million of highways funding. This funding has targeted junctions near Gosforth Park to make it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 893914 | | RESIDENT | LP2015383 | I do not see any specific proposals for improving cycle routes. Wagonways are excellent as the basis of these, but the surfaces of them are not all good enough for cycling. Other routes need developing as well. For example, Station Road Benton is a very dangerous road to cycle on, particularly under the Metro bridge at Benton station, and many cyclists chose to use the footpath here, which | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed highway improvements in the Borough reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | is itself dangerous as the path is narrow and constrained by railings. There exists a parallel route used by some cyclists, using the un-adopted road which links The Oval with Westcroft Road, but the surface of this is diabolical in wet weather. Also links at the western end of the very useful west-east wagonway which served Rising Sun Colliery could be developed in the westerly direction to be cycle friendly. | | | Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. The Local Plan supports safe, convenient and accessible routes for cyclists and implementing improvements to strategic and local routes as development proposals come forward Policy S10.3 and DM10.4 (now policies S7.3 and DM7.4). | |
| 894604 | | RESIDENT | LP2015409 | Priority Transport Improvements I have shown on the enclosed plan the proposed TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENT ROAD moved to the east of the A19 and shown in blue for two very important and valid reasons. 1. There is a major accident black spot at the junction of the B1322 and the A1056 Seghill, Backworth, Killingworth junction. Providing a roundabout at this junction would virtually eliminate major accidents and could provide an easier junction for traffic leaving the A19 southbound. 2. There would be a major benefit to Backworth Village as the relocation of this route to the east of the A19 would provide a very much needed by-pass to Backworth Village without a great cost. As you will be aware the road through Backworth Village is very narrow and not at all designed to cope with the excessively heavy volume of very large lorries that use this road as a shortcut to Silverlink and Cobalt. The large lorries are so close to the pavement and indeed on many occasions the wing mirrors of | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted and the suggested transport improvements will be passed onto the highways engineers for consideration as part of the future junction improvements throughout the Borough. | Comment passed to colleagues in the Highways team. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | these lorries actually project over the kerbs and so close to children walking to school - something must be done before there is a fatality. (Representation also logged against Policy AS7.4) | | | | |
| 893913 | | | LP2015414 | I have the following concerns: Increased traffic on already busy roads that are in poor state of repair and constantly being dug up. No doubt more pointless sets of traffic lights will be erected, similar to the lights outside Wellfield Estate that constantly stop four lanes of traffic on Earsdon Road when no traffic or personnel are waiting at the Wellfield side! Also concerned about Transport Services. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. North Tyneside now operates a new permit scheme for organisations that wish to dig up roads in the Borough. North Tyneside is the first local authority to introduce this scheme as previously utility works could be carried out without needing to inform the Council, but now the Council will operate a scheme to minimise unnecessary delays. The traffic signals on Earsdon Road were installed as a result of a planning condition placed on the West Park development. When the lights were activated in August 2014 there were traffic flow issues in the area and changes were made to the signals in order to address these issues. The junction itself is still being monitored by the Local Authorities Traffic Team to determine when further changes will be required in relation to the increasing | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | occupancy of West Park. | |
| 444906 | | RESIDENT | LP2015434 | All the proposed developments to major roads are welcomed as necessary given the increased traffic. But improvements to public transport are even more important so the Council needs to work hard with transport providers to enable and encourage such improvements. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council will be working in cooperation with public transport providers in preparation of the Local Plan. | Expand the consultation list for public transport providers |
| 894730 | | RESIDENT | LP2015443 | The roads cannot cope with traffic now so how can it cope with an extra 3,000 new homes and when the Cobalt is only half full. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed. |
| 895180 | | RESIDENT | LP2015491 | Access to Whitley Bay via car is not sustainable by building new houses. Those who work further away need to drive! | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Good connectivity both within North Tyneside and to the wider regional and national transport network, is important and the Local Plan supports the delivery of an improved transport network for North Tyneside to ensure integration of land-use and transport planning – Policy S10.3 and Policy DM10.4 (now Policies S7.3 and DM7.4). | No amendments proposed. |
| 793403 | | RESIDENT | LP2015553 | Concerned about cross-boundary transport issues in north Newcastle - particularly proposals for cycle lanes on Gosforth High St. The narrowness of this road makes it unsuitable (detailed comments forwarded to | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Cycle lanes on Gosforth High Street is a Newcastle Council issue but the Local Plan does recognise the importance of strategic transport routes in Policy S10.3 and DM10.4 (now Policies S7.3 | Further update on the formation of the combined authority and its role in transport planning. Specific example of joint working |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | | | Newcastle City Council). | | | and DM7.4). However, the emphasis of working with partners to improve cross boundary transport routes could be further emphasised in the Local Plan. | with Newcastle on coast road cycle route added |
| 471682 | | RESIDENT | LP2015554 | The roundabout at the Jolly Bowman needs updating - already in the morning we have traffic over a mile long. What is the use of building more houses if the infrastructure cannot cope. The same will apply on Station Road if improvements are not made. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough, which include works to the A191 at the top of Station Road and the Jolly Bowman roundabout, have been calculated based on the levels of growth set out in the Local Plan with the aim to make it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396449 | Cyclists Touring Club | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015587 | S10.3 Transport 1st line: Future provision of transport would be better as Future transport provision. 2nd par, from 2nd sentence. More accurate wording would be: The A19 provides a vital south to north route from Sunderland and South Tyneside to Northumberland, connecting with the A1 (not the A1M) at Seaton Burn. There are also a number of key west to east links providing access from Newcastle to the coast, including the A191, the A1058 (Coast Road) and the A193 (Hadrian Road is the A187). The Road Network 2)d. A1(M) should be A1. Pedestrians, Cyclists and Horse-Riders 3)a. walking and cycle routes should be walking and cycling routes. | | S 10.3 Transport | Agreed. The suggested amendments will be made | Amendments made. Provision of transport changed to 'transport provision'; north to south changed to 'south to north' for the A19 and east to west changed to 'west to east' for connections with Newcastle to the coast; walking and cycle routes changed to walking and cycling; Hadrian road changed to A187 from A193 and reference to A1 (M) changed to A1. |
| 897298 | | RESIDENT | LP2015608 | 3000 homes means possibly 6000 more cars in an already gridlocked traffic area during peak times. How do you propose to solve these issues and where can I find your plans? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Further information of the junction improvements is in the Council Magazine and available on the Council website – if you follow the link there is information on page 38 and 39 - http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/sites/default/files/web-page-related-files/Our%20North%20Tyneside%20Residents%20Magazine%20Spring%202015.pdf | |
| 897641 | | RESIDENT | LP2015651 | Also, I would request that you come with me any morning, and observe the gridlock effect. The roads around most of North Tyneside were not built for half of the current number of cars, in fact in many streets, if cars park on the road, it becomes single lane, your response to date has been to lower the speed limit. You are also looking at such as traffic lights at the end of the coast road. The issue is that the road infrastructure is unable to cope with the ever increasing traffic. This will certainly become an increasing issue, as we also lack a strong public transport system. The metro is good, but people use their cars to get to it, as bus links do not exist. It is in fact a mish-mash of ideas, which is now beyond control, without knocking down large areas of housing to provide further roads. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council is committed to transport improvements in the Borough and over the next five years is undertaking a series of works making it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. These improvements would not be the only solution to the levels of growth anticipated in the Local Plan and Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3) sets out the need to work towards a integrated strategic public transport network that improves the ease of change for example between bus and Metro. This is seen to be vital for public transport to become an increasingly attractive option and ensure a shift from private transport. Policy DM10.4 (now DM7.4) also outlines a set of criteria to be taken into account with new development and its relationship to the transport network so that 'all new development is well | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | serviced by an attractive choice of transport modes, including public transport, footpaths and cycle routes.' | |
| 396641 | | RESIDENT | LP2015688 | I am concerned about the impact of extra traffic on Station Road if all of the proposed housing in that area is allowed to be built. There are already very congested times during the day when people naturally access Station Road to go to work, school, shopping etc. Alternative access is needed. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough have reflected the levels of growth set out in the Local Plan, including the sites around Station Road, and will aim to make it easier and safer to travel in the Borough. Further information of the junction improvements are detailed in the Council Magazine and available to view on the Council website – if you follow the link the relevant information is on page 38 and 39 - http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/sites/default/files/web-page-related-files/Our%20North%20Tyneside%20Residents%20Magazine%20Spring%202015.pdf . | No amendments proposed. |
| 805490 | | RESIDENT | LP2015703 | The roads from Monkseaton, New York, Shiremoor, West Allotment, Cobalt, Silverlink, Holystone, Backworth, Killingworth, Forest Hall, Benton, Longbenton are already full of traffic, gridlocked at peak times. They will not be able to cope with the extra traffic from 4,500 houses and a 17 hectares employment site. A gross overdevelopment of the Murton and Killingworth Moor sites. The South of the borough has the A1058 dual carriageway new coast road from North Shields to Heaton, and the A193 Howdon Road from North Shields to Walkerville. In the mid area of the borough from Monkseaton to Longbenton | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | /Killingworth apart from the new dual Shiremoor by-pass + Earsdon/Wellfield sections we have 'B' roads and country lanes that are clogged up at peak times, the old coast road (Whitley Road) ,Great Lime Road, New York Road, Rake Lane, Backworth Lane, Killingworth Lane. A new road from the Grey Horse roundabout should run North West by-passing Backworth and join the A1056 (known as The Northern Gate Way as it joins the A1 to the A19) at the A19 intersection. | | | | |
| 898560 | | RESIDENT | LP2015831 | Improvements to road infrastructure are also needed so it is good news that a number of schemes are planned. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898591 | | RESIDENT | LP2015850 | The local road infrastructure currently gridlocks regularly at prime times. Despite the proposed new road through Murton the additional vehicles from such a huge development is of serious concern. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The strategic housing sites identified in Policy AS7.4 (now Policy S4.4) for Killingworth and Murton would be accompanied with a masterplan identifying access routes and public transport corridors. An access and transport strategy would need to be developed that maximises walking, cycling and use of public transport opportunities for both Killingworth and Murton. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 467822 | | RESIDENT | LP2015874 | We need trolley buses going from Ashington down to the coast maybe going to Sunderland via Wallsend and other buses and Trolley coming from West End Newcastle to the Coast. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan supports the retention and protection of essential infrastructure that would facilitate sustainable passenger and freight connections between Ashington and the rest of the Borough with connections to the wider Tyne and Wear region. This proposal is a key aspiration of Northumberland County Council and the North East Strategic Economic Plan. Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3) of the Local Plan reflects this ambition to safeguard the Ashington, Blyth and Tyne Railway line and this is shown on the Policies Map. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898767 | | | LP2015910 | We strongly object to the in fill of further green field sites along Whitley Road. 1. Increased traffic congestion along Front Street and backing up along Whitley Rd with likely increased stop start and idling motors due to the conversion of Four Lane Ends roundabout to traffic lights; consequent threat to our health from diesel particulates and other contaminants. 2. 5. We note that at least 1 approved housing development "" for 9 houses on Front Street on the Black Bull site is not marked in the plan. Perhaps there are other small pockets that have not been revealed? 3. What steps will the council take to ensure that sustainable transport such as cycling and access to metro stations is given priority in planning decisions and where is the network of cycle paths to enable commuters into Newcastle from Benton to safely use cycle transport via direct routes, giving cyclists precedence over cars. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has to provide for the future needs of the Borough. The evidence on housing and job projections for North Tyneside over the next 15 years are positive but this places a requirement on the authority to plan for this growth. There is a lack of sites that have already been built on to accommodate the future levels of growth. Sites that have been granted planning permission (such as the Black Bull) have been calculated in the future provision of housing for the Borough but it is not considered a large enough site to be marked on the Plan. The Council has therefore had to suggest green field sites for development (such as those around the Rising Sun), but with objective to also protect and enhance the natural environment and enhance the image of the Borough. Green links are considered in Policy DM8.2 'Protection of Green Infrastructure' (now Policy DM5.2) and the intention of the policy is to be | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | positive with a strategic approach to green links through the Borough. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough (including the A191) will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Local Plan includes policies that will improve the access to and safety of Metro Stations with a clear requirement for partners to work together to improve public transport interchanges so facilitate better integration between modes of transport. The Local Plan also covers accessibility of cycle routes in the Borough with the clear direction to improve local and strategic cycle routes that are safe, convenient and well connected Policy S10.3 and Policy DM10.4, (now policies S7.3 and DM7.4). | |
| 898853 | | RESIDENT | LP2015957 | Suggestion: Close the vehicle access from Preston Road - Camp Terrace. Advantages: (a) reduce traffic congestion at traffic lights Preston Road/ Q. Alex. (b) conserve the listed cobbles and heritage buildings . Much easier, safer gateway at the west end of camp terrace. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The changes suggested to the highway are not an issue to be covered within the Local Plan but the comments have been passed on to the Highway Network Manager for their consideration. | No amendments proposed. |
| 587121 | Nexus | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015964 | Reference is made in S10.3 (1) to protection of a site on Earsdon Road, related to the potential Cobalt Metro extension "" this is | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The site is shown on the Policies as map as a transport safeguarded route. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | welcome, but the site should ideally be indicated on the proposals map, for the avoidance of doubt. | | | | |
| 898920 | Sustrans | | LP2015988 | Sustrans are concerned that the commitment to sustainable transport is weak and heavily caveated. Given North Tyneside's historic commitment to sustainable transport we would prefer to see explicit commitment to deliver a functioning walking and cycling network. There seems again to be a confusion between walking and cycling networks and green infrastructure. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan includes policies that will improve the accessibility of cycle routes in the Borough Policy DM10.4, (now policy DM7.4)) and work with partners to deliver improved local and strategic cycle routes that are safe and convenient Policy S10.3, (now policy S7.3). Green Infrastructure routes, as outlined in the Planning Practice Guidance, can include walking and cycle routes. This is reflected in the Local Plan, which also supports future walking and cycling routes, using green infrastructure. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151008 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151009 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151012 | Direct access from A19 to Cobalt is the best option for all concerned. Also there is no necessity for commercial traffic to use A191 when access to the coast road/ A19 is available via Silverlink. Removing the necessity for commercial vehicles to route through residential areas:- I.e. A191. The whole idea has been hidden from residents of area and the properties will no longer have any value. The Council wouldn't like a dual | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan does not determine the routes that commercial traffic use within the Borough. Funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout and these works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | carriageway at the bottom of their garden. | | | process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151013 | There is no necessity for commercial traffic to access the A19 via the A191 as access is available to A19 via Coast road off Silverlink which is not residential. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan does not determine the routes that commercial traffic use within the Borough. Funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout and these works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151015 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151017 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151018 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151020 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151021 | A191 is already extremely close to residential properties. Any widening work undertaking would obviously mean the A191 being even closer to residential properties. Restricting access to Murray fields (no right turn) is only going to increase traffic turning into West Allotment. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151024 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151025 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151028 | Direct access from A19 to Cobalt is the best option for all concerned. Also there is no necessity for commercial traffic to use A191 when access to the coast road/ A19 is available via Silverlink. Removing the necessity for commercial vehicles to route through residential areas:- I.e. A191. The whole idea has been hidden from residents of area and the properties will no longer have any value. The Council wouldn't like a dual carriageway at the bottom of their garden. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan does not determine the routes that commercial traffic use within the Borough. Funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout and these works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151029 | There is no necessity for commercial traffic to access the A19 via the A191 as access is available to A19 via coast road off Silverlink which is not residential. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan does not determine the routes that commercial traffic use within the Borough. Funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout and these works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151031 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | No amendments proposed. |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151033 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | | around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151034 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151036 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151037 | A191 is already extremely close to residential properties. Any widening work undertaking would obviously mean the A191 being even closer to residential properties. Restricting access to Murray Fields (no right turn) is only going to increase traffic turning into West Allotment. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | No amendments proposed. |
| 797386 | | | LP20151082 | More safe cycling routes needed. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Local Plan includes policies that will improve the accessibility of cycle routes in the Borough (Policy DM10.4, now policy DM7.4) and work with partners to deliver improved local and strategic cycle routes that are safe and convenient (Policy S10.3, now policy S7.3). | |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151133 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151134 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough (which include along the A191) will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151139 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. "ç | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151141 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151142 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | No amendments proposed |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151144 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | <p>residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site?</p> | | | <p>the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site.</p> | |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151145 | <p>Perhaps some consideration could be made to the internal roundabouts of the Cobalt Business Park, which are totally inadequate at rush hour, especially 1700hrs when workers all leave at once.</p> | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes which include the A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt).</p> | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared for each scheme and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151148 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151149 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151156 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151157 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | No amendments proposed |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151159 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | <p>3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site?</p> | | | <p>detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site.</p> | |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151160 | <p>Perhaps some consideration could be made to the internal roundabout of the Cobalt Business Park, which are totally inadequate at rush hours, especially 1700hrs when workers all leave at once.</p> | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major</p> | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | improvement schemes which include the A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt). These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared for each scheme and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151162 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. "ç | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151166 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | is good value for money. | |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151167 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151171 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. "ç | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151173 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151174 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | | the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151176 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | | process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151180 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151181 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151185 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. "ç | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151188 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151190 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151191 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | is good value for money. | |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151194 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | No amendments proposed |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151195 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151198 | I don't see how the Holystone interchange can be widened further without knocking down the flyover and rebuilding as the concrete pillars would be in the way to widen the roundabout lanes to 3 or 4. Rather than have the expense, surely it makes sense to build a new interchange further down the A19 to allow for direct access to the Cobalt business park. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). One of the schemes is the A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt). These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. An Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and this will allow for comprehensive public consultation. Further information of the consultation will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151201 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | | the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151202 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151204 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151205 | I am not happy about the proposal to widen the A191 to 4 lanes directly behind my property as this will just attract more cars, noise and pollution. My daughter already complains about the noise at night when she can't get to sleep. It makes more sense to build a new interchange further down the A19 with direct access to the Cobalt Business Park. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). One of the schemes is the A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt). The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. However, the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151208 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | No amendments proposed |
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151209 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | dark winter nights. | | | the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151210 | I am particularly concerned over increased noise levels and access in and out of West Allotment from both junctions, given that it is already difficult, both as a pedestrian and driver. My concern is with widening the A191 Holystone Interchange to accommodate more traffic. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151212 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. "ç | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151215 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151216 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151218 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151222 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151223 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151227 | 4 laned road and roundabout right next to a school is a recipe for disaster! | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). One of the schemes is the A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt). The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. However, the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | consultation process will commence, which will allow for you to raise your concerns of traffic adjacent to a school based on the designs that will be drawn up. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151228 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. "ç | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151231 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151232 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | | highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151234 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | | consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151235 | Provide access to A19 from Cobalt business park! More future proof. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt Business Park but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). One of the schemes is the A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151239 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151240 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151242 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. "ç | | | investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | |
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151244 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151245 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151247 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | No amendments proposed |
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151248 | Our house backs onto the road (A191) and the traffic noise is terrible with only 3 lanes. If it increases to 4 lanes it will be closer to our home and also unbearably noisy. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). One of the schemes is the A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt). The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. However, the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money.</p> | |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151261 | S10.3 Transport Our Client supports the proposed policy to enhance public transport, the road network and pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. This proposed policy has | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Plan outlines the cooperation of working with neighbouring authorities in the Policy and outlines significant transport infrastructure that | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | been prepared strategically in regards to the provision of transport infrastructure (NPPF, 156) for the Borough. Our Client particularly supports the proposal to make priority improvements to the national strategic network, focused on the key locations coming from the A19. In particular our Client requests that improvements are implemented as a priority to the A19(T)/A1056 Killingworth Interchange, as this will be required to support any new development. Our Client would suggest that the proposed policy should explain and incorporate how the proposed transport infrastructure improvements will benefit cross-boundary travel (NPPF, 31), into areas such as Newcastle (where the closest City Centre is located) and into Northumberland (for accessibility to areas such as the heritage coast and the National Park). | | | would have impacts to surrounding areas. | |
| 898630 | | | LP20151275 | The proposed development of housing in sites 17, 111, and 139, and the industrial use of Site 11 now Site E010, will only increase the traffic west bound along Whitley Road and southbound along Station Road. The roads cannot cope as it is with the current situation, the addition of nearly 2500 houses already planned in the local area will make this worse, and the addition of more industrial units and yet more housing on those sites will make it intolerable. The improvements to the roads proposed are welcome, but I think they will only alleviate the present condition, not prepare the area for 4000+ 2,3,4 bedroom houses. I wholeheartedly welcome the proposals to retain trackbed for a potential | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, but it was considered important to make the public aware of these strategic improvements to the highway network in the Local Plan consultation summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>expansion of the metro to Blyth and for cyclists, and the north/south link to Percy Main, the Cobalt office park desperately needs this. I would welcome the re-instatement, or setting aside, of the north west curve of the metro/main line for a link for the metro/light rail to Morpeth/Forest Hall/Killingworth/Cramlington, which would alleviate the traffic problems for those people travelling in from South East Northumberland (the rail route from Morpeth is the one of the most overcrowded in the country). I know there are technical issues with this but they could be overcome in both the short and the long term. For example, reinvigorated London tube carriages could use diesel propulsion on the main line from say (No Suggestions) (which I think still has sidings to cope with this) then switch to the metro voltage from Benton to Longbenton and perhaps terminate at the metro yards at South Gosforth or even go on to the airport. This would really help with inbound traffic. To repeat what I have already said elsewhere in case it is missed: In section 2.18 you said that the borough had good transport links, but I don't agree with this statement. The metro has not been expanded since 2002 and it is very expensive. I expect the current poor service to improve after all of the work but the worse its service, the more people will move to cars. It is cheaper to travel on the tube in London than on the metro and their GDP per head is significantly greater than ours. The north south public transport links are poor and reliant on congested roads. Provision for</p> | | | <p>across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Works concerning the impact of the residential development sites in the Local Plan are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation works to accommodate the increased numbers of traffic movements on the highway network. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>cyclists is poor - it's dangerous or convoluted to use your bicycle here. The 'A191 corridor' and the traffic to it from Killingworth - along Great Lime Road down through Forest Hall and Benton, and from it into Wallsend down Station Road is already congested. It is my understanding from talking to council officials that bus services will come when the housing is built, but this will be too late - people will get used to using their cars. The roads cannot cope as it is. I hope the proposed improvements along the A191 help, but I cannot see how they will support the two thousand plus 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses already planned, and the new houses already being built; never mind the new housing you propose for the remaining green fields around Whitley Road, which would add another 650 houses to the mix. Nearly 4000 houses, probably a lot of them with two cars. How can the infrastructure cope with this? Your own stats say that North Tyneside has the highest car ownership in Tyne and Wear. The proposed housing, not served well by public transport or the metro, being sold to 'executives', will only make getting around the borough by car even harder, and this will have a long term economic impact on the borough's economy. Road congestion cost the UK economy £13bn in 2013 according to the CEPD. I think you may also want to reflect on why the borough has the largest car ownership in Tyne and Wear, is this a result of the public transport provision in the borough or the building of houses without putting in the infrastructure to cope with them? It can't</p> | | | <p>will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. The Borough does have good transport links and the Local Plan supports a comprehensive, integrated, safe, accessible and efficient public transport network, capable of supporting development proposals and providing attractive alternative travel options. However, the Local Plan is not responsible for the ticket prices of public transport. The Local Plan supports an integrated approach towards sustainable development and working with its transport partners the Plan seeks to deliver cross boundary improvements, such as improvements to the cycle network and ensuring the protection of strategic transport routes Policy S10.3 and DM10.4 (now S7.3 and DM7.4) If the introduction/extension of a bus service was to be provided as part of a planning application its implementation</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | be because we are all rich because our average wage is lower than the Tyne and Wear average. Your stats say that 83% of journeys into the borough are made by car and only 14% by public transport. This is quite a damning statistic. I don't blame the council for this, but I think, along with the point about car ownership, this shows where investment/support is needed. It would be useful to know the breakdown of the 25,000 inward commuters. If a significant number come from South East Northumberland then this would strengthen the argument for better metro connections to perhaps Blyth and the north south link to Percy Main, and the improvement and reopening of commuter rail/metro services from the north. | | | would be considered on its planning merits, as to when the service would commence, it would not necessarily be at the completion of the scheme. | |
| 899455 | | | LP20151284 | The proposed development of housing in sites 17, 111, and 139, and the industrial use of Site 11 now Site E010, will only increase the traffic west bound along Whitley Road and southbound along Station Road. The roads cannot cope as it is with the current situation, the addition of nearly 2500 houses already planned in the local area will make this worse, and the addition of more industrial units and yet more housing on those sites will make it intolerable. I support the proposals to retain trackbed for a potential expansion of the metro to Blyth and for cyclists, and the north/south link to Percy Main. Improve rail links to Morpeth/Forest Hall/Killingworth/Cramlington, which would alleviate the traffic problems for those people travelling in from South East Northumberland. | S 10.3 | Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. With the announcement of the transport funding being released at the same time as the Local Plan, but it was considered important to make the public aware of these strategic improvements to the highway network in the Local Plan consultation summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Works concerning the impact of the residential development sites in the Local Plan are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation works to accommodate the increased numbers of traffic movements on the highway network. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. The Borough does have good transport links and the Local Plan supports a comprehensive, integrated, safe, accessible and efficient public transport network, capable of supporting development proposals and providing attractive alternative travel options. The Local Plan supports an integrated approach towards sustainable development and working with its transport partners the Plan seeks to deliver cross boundary improvements, such as improvements to the cycle network and ensuring the protection of strategic transport routes (Policy S10.3 and DM10.4, now policies S7.3 and DM7.4). Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. With the announcement of the transport funding being released at the same time as the Local Plan, but it was considered important to make the public aware of these strategic improvements to the highway network in the Local Plan consultation summary leaflet. The proposed highway improvements reflect the anticipated levels of economic growth across the Borough's key employment sites, namely Quorum, Cobalt, Indigo Park, and North Bank of the Tyne (inc. Tyne Tunnel Trading Est.). There are four major improvement schemes; A19 employment corridor access improvements (A19 Holystone to Cobalt), Coach Lane and Tyne View Park (A191 corridor), A1056 Weetslade Corridor (Sandy Lane), North Bank of Tyne. These works focus on improving the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Works concerning the impact of the residential development sites in the Local Plan are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). The STM highlights those junctions that would require further mitigation works to accommodate the</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>increased numbers of traffic movements on the highway network. Further detailed work on what mitigation would be required will be developed as the Local Plan progresses. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. The Borough does have good transport links and the Local Plan supports a comprehensive, integrated, safe, accessible and efficient public transport network, capable of supporting development proposals and providing attractive alternative travel options. The Local Plan supports an integrated approach towards sustainable development and working with its transport partners the Plan</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | seeks to deliver cross boundary improvements, such as improvements to the cycle network and ensuring the protection of strategic transport routes Policy S10.3 and DM10.4 (now S7.3 and DM7.4). | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151386 | Policy S10:3. CPRE welcomes this policy. Support for the Metro upgrade could be reflected throughout the Plan, supporting the spatial distribution strategies for housing and employment site locations. CPRE acknowledges that proposals for road improvements are moderate in extent but they should not lead to extensive new road building. The policies on walking, cycling and horse riding are welcome. However there is a missed opportunity in promoting walking and cycling for journeys to work, education, shopping or use of community facilities as well as for leisure. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) does identify and support the Metro system upgrade and this is considered sufficient as the Plan repeats its support for the Metro system towards achieving sustainable development throughout the Plan. The Plan also promotes walking and cycling to work, education, shopping or use of community facilities as well as for leisure throughout the Plan e.g. Policy S10.3 (now S7.3), DM2.2 (now S1.4) and Policy DM10.4 (now Policies S7.9, S1.4 and DM7.4). | No amendments proposed |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151416 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151417 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151418 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151422 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809).</p> | |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151424 | <p>Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School?</p> | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website.</p> | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151425 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | No amendments proposed |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151428 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | | the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151436 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151437 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151441 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | | Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151443 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | | the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151444 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151446 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | No amendments proposed |
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151456 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | dark winter nights. | | | the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151454 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151461 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151464 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151465 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151467 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | |
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151468 | Very concerned about the no right turn east bound as all of Murray Fields and the taxis needing to turn right will now be accessing past my home that is already very busy since the no right turn at the Northumberland arms. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151471 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151472 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151474 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | | residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 (now S7.10) 'Community Infrastructure' and Policy S10.1 (now S7.1) 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. | |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151476 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151478 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | No amendments proposed |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151479 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | | for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151481 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | | be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. | |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151482 | Very concerned about the no right turn east bound as all of Murray Fields and the taxis needing to turn right will now be accessing past my home that is already very busy since the no right turn at the Northumberland Arms. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151491 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | No amendments proposed |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151493 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | | covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151498 | We live at 20 Holyfields and have been here 20yrs during this time the noise from increased Traffic has increased and the thought of extra lanes on the A191 doesn't bear thinking about, we have to sleep with the windows closed during the summer because of the noise and we have changed the windows for thicker glazing to cut down on noise, surely an direct road from the A19 direct to cobalt would solve the problem. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151499 | we are against the widening of the West Allotment bypass. Its horrendous to live with we have put thicker windows in because we can't sleep not to mention pollution, noise pollution and de-valuing our properties making them harder to sell. This is a disgrace and the Council need to come up with an alternative method. You are not considering residents at all or pedestrians (Its horrendous now). | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151506 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | No amendments proposed |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151508 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | | benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151509 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151511 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | suggested development on the Murton site. | |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151514 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | No amendments proposed |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151516 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151517 | We live at 20 Holyfields and have been here 20yrs during this time the noise from increased Traffic has increased and the thought of extra lanes on the A191 doesn't bear thinking about, we have to sleep with the windows closed during the summer because of the noise and we have changed the windows for thicker glazing to cut down on noise, surely an direct road from the A19 direct to cobalt would solve the problem. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151519 | we are against the widening of the West Allotment bypass. Its horrendous to live with we have put thicker windows in because we can't sleep not to mention pollution, noise pollution and de-valuing our properties making them harder to sell. This is a disgrace and the Council need to come up with an alternative method. You are not considering residents at all or pedestrians (Its horrendous now). | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151521 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | No amendments proposed |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151524 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | | The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151523 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | | the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151526 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151559 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151560 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | No amendments proposed |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151566 | The noise is terrible now from the traffic. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151569 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151572 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | No amendments proposed |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151573 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151575 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 899991 | Tyne and Wear Public Transport Users Group | RESIDENT | LP20151577 | S10.3 Transport Overall we want to see lower fares, and a simpler fare/pass structure, across all forms of an integrated public transport. We think that these are an essential part of encouraging people to make less use of cars. Public Transport We want to see policies that aim at faster upgrading of all metro stations to make them safer. We also look for policies that will help to reduce unsocial behaviour on bus and metro journeys with the aim of making public transport feel safer for all passengers but especially for women and older people. These groups, and others, tell us of the advantages that come from public transport that offers a relaxed , clean and comfortable journey. We also think that the plan should set out proposals to provide toilets at all stations and take into account the need for facilities that will allow breast feeding. We would also like to see | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Policy S10.3 (Now 7.3) does outline the Councils intention to work with its partners to secure a comprehensive, integrated, safe, accessible and efficient public transport network, capable of supporting development proposals and providing attractive alternatives travel options. The conditions of pavements are a matter that would need to be taken up with the Councils highways team. Further information to report concerns can be found on the Council website - https://reportit.northtyneside.gov.uk/Highways/CreateHighwaysCase.aspx | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | <p>provision made at major metro stations to support the hire/use of shopping mobility scooters. This is especially important given the restrictions that individuals face on using their own scooters on Metro. We aspire to see cycles accommodated on Metro, with more cycle rails for secure parking of cycles outside Metro stations, shops and other public buildings. We hope that the Cycling festival coming to the North East in June , with the testing of introduction of cycles on metro , will continue, even if this is metro trains out of peak times to begin with. The Road Network We are concerned at the conditions of pavements across the borough that causes huge costs for the health service and employers, as well as the dire consequences for individuals. This especially affects older people. There are still, despite the efforts of the Council, places without the drop kerb that is essential for wheelchairs, mobility scooters and prams and trolleys. Unless more attention is paid to walking and cycling there will be huge health implications for our young people, where the recent statistics are that youngsters are 25% obese. We would like to see a "recycle your bike" facility in N. Tyneside.</p> | | | | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151586 | <p>The side of my house is infect closer to the West Allotment bypass than any of the houses. EVEN NOW it is extremely noisy, something should be done now regarding leaving the bypass and entering into West Allotment. My house is the first turn into the estate from the bypass after the big roundabout. I have put several concerns and</p> | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million</p> | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | phone calls after viewing from my back upstairs window and witnessing crashes; and people almost getting knocked down from the poor markings from the bypass onto the estate. Alter NOW. | | | funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | |
| 900011 | | RESIDENT | LP20151591 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900011 | | RESIDENT | LP20151593 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed |
| 900011 | | RESIDENT | LP20151597 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. "c | | | Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900011 | | RESIDENT | LP20151600 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | | funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900011 | | RESIDENT | LP20151604 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | | process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900011 | | RESIDENT | LP20151606 | At the present we find it difficult coming out of Holyfields at the peak times of traffic going to and from the Cobalt and Shiremoor East now which will be a lot worse when the Cobalt is fully occupied. An exit road direct to and from the A19 to Cobalt would have more sense than increasing the Lanes directly behind Holyfields. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the growth suggested in the Local Plan. The Council has already been | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151619 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151620 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151625 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. | |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151626 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151628 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151629 | At the present we find it difficult coming out of Holyfields at the Peak times of traffic going to and from the cobalt and Shiremoor east now which will be a lot worse when the cobalt is fully occupied. An exit road direct to and from the A19 to cobalt would have more sense than increasing the lanes directly behind Holyfields. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the growth suggested in the Local Plan. The Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed |
| 900101 | | RESIDENT | LP20151632 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | | invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900101 | | RESIDENT | LP20151633 | We back onto the A191 and are gravely concerned to learn of this work, not to mention months of roadworks and a future of unable to sell the property. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, but it was considered important to make the public | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>aware of these strategic improvements to the highway network in the Local Plan consultation summary leaflet. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3</p> | |
| 900101 | | RESIDENT | LP20151635 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP</p> | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | rising noise levels to existing residents? | | | (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900101 | | RESIDENT | LP20151636 | The increased noise and traffic is very concerning. It is impossible to sit out in the summer now without headphones in, I dread to think about what this will do to the value of houses. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900103 | | RESIDENT | LP20151639 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900103 | | RESIDENT | LP20151640 | We back onto the A191 and are gravely concerned to learn of this work, not to mention months of roadworks and a future of unable to sell the property. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. | |
| 900103 | | RESIDENT | LP20151643 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed |
| 900103 | | RESIDENT | LP20151644 | The increased noise and traffic is very concerning. It is impossible to sit out in the summer now without headphones in, I dread to think about what this will do to the value of | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | houses! | | | detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151661 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | | prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151662 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| | | | LP20151664 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 'Community Infrastructure' and Policy S10.1 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151667 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | bypass. "ç | | | and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151669 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151670 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151672 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | No amendments proposed |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151673 | I would like to know how close this 4th Lane will encroach on my property. How do I or my parents sleep with the increased noise. How | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | do I use my garden with cars running past my rear garden fence?? | | | The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151674 | Traffic noise is already a major problem for me as my property back onto the road. If you widen it, it will encroach on my property even more, this is not fair and will drop the value of my property. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151679 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151680 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151682 | Current school capacity means that parents are currently not always receiving their first choice of primary school within the local area. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan seeks to consider the needs of current and future residents and how these needs will change | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | This will only get worse with additional proposed homes unless significant new places are made available before the homes are built. | | | over time. The Councils school selection policy and parents preference of school fall outside the issues covered by planning but the provision of education facilities and other key infrastructure is a key consideration for the Local Plan. The importance of school provision is reflected in Policy S10.13 (now S7.10) 'Community Infrastructure' and Policy S10.1(now S7.1) 'General Infrastructure and Funding'. The planning team have been in discussion with the Councils education officers to determine the impact of the proposed level of growth on school places and this has shown the need for an additional primary at both the Murton and Killingworth Moor strategic sites and a new secondary school preferred at Killingworth Moor. The details of the size and location of the proposed new schools will be brought forward as part of the Masterplanning work for the strategic sites at Killingworth Moor and Murton. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151683 | I would like to know how close this 4th lane will encroach on my property, how do I or my parents sleep with the increased noise. How do I use my garden with cars running past my rear garden fence?? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151685 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151688 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151689 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | | highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151691 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | | assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151692 | Traffic noise is already a major problem for me, as my property backs onto the road. If you widen it, it will encroach on my property even more this is not fair and will drop the value of my property. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | |
| 900234 | | RESIDENT | LP20151743 | Priority Transport Improvements (star symbol on proposals map and relevant plan text) Support improvements at Norham Road Interchange: Coast Road - Norham Road junction. Badly needs improvement, even if just mini roundabouts at the two junctions of slip roads and Norham Road. Traffic comes from all directions and so hard to turn out of sliproads. This is a real problem, now made worse again now that the Coast Road Retail Park is occupied again as it adds to northbound Norham Road traffic especially from Tesco. A marked contrast to generally good roads in North Tyneside. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 900308 | Places for People | | LP20151780 | (Comments with input from Urban Splash) North Tyneside has the highest level of car ownership in Tyne & Wear and still rising (increase of 8% in last 10 years), with 83% commuting by car. We would recommend that local policies, which currently support car | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | ownership, should be revisited to encourage higher uptake of public transport in the interest of more sustainable development. The good local transport links are recognised in the Plan. | | | | |
| 463486 | | | LP20151846 | Traffic is already serious in the West Moor area without more development. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Policy S10.3 (now S7.3) and Policy DM10.4 (DM7.4) consider transport infrastructure from the large strategic issues (e.g. potential Metro extensions) down to footpaths and cycle way improvements that help ensure an integrated transport approach to travelling throughout the Borough. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 900515 | | RESIDENT | LP20151849 | I have already had to change my work start time due to heavy traffic trying to get from Whitley Bay to the A1058. The roads are already too busy. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 900519 | | RESIDENT | LP20151859 | Has pressure on road use been taken into account in the Plan? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed |
| 900521 | | RESIDENT | LP20151861 | No by-pass running into another bottleneck. No by-pass! | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The strategic housing sites identified in Policy AS7.4 (AS4.4) for Killingworth and Murton would be accompanied with a masterplan identifying access routes and public transport corridors. An access and transport strategy would | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | need to be developed for both sites that maximises walking, cycling and use of public transport opportunities for both Killingworth and Murton. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151962 | Natural England supports the use of GI as a method of providing routes for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders as part of the multifunctional benefits that GI can offer. | | S 10.3 Transport | Support noted Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 396511 | GVA | PLANNING CONSULTANCY | LP20152013 | In the opening paragraph it may be clearer to state "future provision of transport infrastructure" . In part 1(a) of the policy the consortium would suggest removing reference to the "all change programme" . This requires readers to cross reference to a document which may not always be relevant or easily accessible. The final bullet point within 1(f) refers to new metro stations in the context of safeguarding the network. The consortium would suggest that this should be seen as a separate item on the agenda. At this stage it would be inappropriate to make a firm proposal of a new station (or stations) but it is certainly something which should be investigated and encouraged. Provision of a new metro station would represent a potentially very significant piece of new infrastructure capable of making a development more "sustainable" . One option for the plan would be to "reserve" land for a metro station in the event of funding being available in or beyond the plan period. In part 2 of the policy there is no specific reference to enhancing connectivity in the local road network to take pressure away from the trunk roads. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The wording of transport encapsulates more than just the infrastructure so for clarity it will remain but the suggestion is welcomed. The reference to the 'all change programme' will be removed from the policy, but retained within the supporting text. The final bullet point 1(f) does relate to the overall policy so will remain. The Policy does not make a firm proposal of a new Metro station or stations but outlines how they should be considered where appropriate and linked to potential development sites. The safeguarding of transport routes on the Policies Map stresses the importance of making sure that such routes retain their potential for future transport and not restricted by inappropriate development. Investigations to determine the potential for a new Metro station or stations within the strategic development sites at Murton and Killingworth would be considered as part of the future masterplans for these sites. The work of the masterplans could potentially lead to further safeguarded transport routes being identified in the Local Plan. Part two of the Policy does make specific reference to | Reference to Metro 'all change' removed in the Policy but retain in the supporting text. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | improvements planned to enhancing the local road network and there is further information in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | |
| 901136 | | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP20152064 | <p>Newcastle supports the objective to provide sustainable access to the wider region and welcomes the introductory text in Policy S10.3 Transport which sets out the strategic transport links to Newcastle City Centre. Additionally, the priorities for improvements including the Coast Road and Sandy Lane are supported as these will have a major impact on Newcastle's network as identified in Strategic Traffic Model 2015. However, we would like to understand in more detail the cross boundary impacts of proposed growth. It would be helpful if further detail on the current network operation (without development) could be provided and also detail on sites trip rates in order to assess the headline trip generation figures quoted in section 4.3. The use of TRICS or developer information has been referenced in section 4.1. It is suggested that trip rate information should be provided in an expanded Appendix A1. Part 3 of Policy S10.3 Transport outlines the intention to develop cycle routes. Given the commitment to developing the Coast Road in the Newcastle Cycle City Ambition Fund Phase 2 Bid it is suggested that reference should be made to the intention to develop cycle routes from the Borough to the wider area. The IDP states that the Coast Road has strong potential to form part of the national cycle network. It is suggested that</p> | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted and support welcomed. The Council will continue to work closely with its neighbouring authorities and will seek to present the transport data (in supporting evidence) so that the impacts of the proposed growth can be referenced. The proposed improvements to the cycle network along the coast road will be included in the Plan.</p> | <p>Include coast road cycle improvements into the Plan and update evidence on transport</p> |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | | text should be included in the Plan to reflect the importance of A1058 as a strategic cycle route. It is recommended that a commitment for development of a public transport strategy should to be included in section 7.7 next steps in order to create sustainable communities. | | | | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152184 | Policy S 10.3- the last sentence of the second paragraph does not read clearly. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted, this will be amended. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | Minor amendments made to policy wording. |
| 808018 | | RESIDENT | LP20152202 | My main concern is the lack of planning (or discussion) for road improvements or new roads (the last consultation was the "Sandy Lane Bypass' this appears to be off the radar?) When do we see the road plan? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The road network along Sandy Lane is one of the areas highlighted for future investment and the timetable of the process of works will be published in the summer as part of a full business case. The information of works will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| | | | LP20152229 | Metro is a disgusting service i.e. delays and cancellations on a daily basis | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Issues concerning delays and cancellations are principally a matter that is the responsibility of NEXUS and the Metro operator. The Local Plan does support proposals to upgrade the Metro system that will hopefully improve the overall public transport provision for the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Borough. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 901347 | | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP20152237 | There is no necessity for commercial traffic to access the A19 via the A191 as access is available to the A19 via Coast Road off Silverlink (which is not residential). | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan does not determine the routes that commercial traffic use within the Borough. Funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout and these works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 901541 | | RESIDENT | LP20152344 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | |
| 901541 | | RESIDENT | LP20152345 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901541 | | RESIDENT | LP20152347 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3</p> | |
| 901541 | | RESIDENT | LP20152349 | <p>Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School?</p> | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 901541 | | RESIDENT | LP20152350 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 901541 | | RESIDENT | LP20152352 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site?</p> | | | <p>for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3</p> | |
| 901549 | | RESIDENT | LP20152355 | <p>The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone</p> | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | | years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 901549 | | RESIDENT | LP20152356 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 901549 | | RESIDENT | LP20152358 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 901549 | | RESIDENT | LP20152360 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 901549 | | RESIDENT | LP20152361 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 901549 | | RESIDENT | LP20152363 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152366 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152367 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152370 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>infrastructure in the Borough to meet the levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3</p> | |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152372 | <p>Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School?</p> | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 901563 | | RESIDENT | LP20152375 | <p>The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a</p> | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt or north of the Holystone Interchange, but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the growth suggested in the Local Plan, but violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | | | |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152380 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152383 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 901564 | | RESIDENT | LP20152384 | <p>The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a</p> | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt or north of the Holystone Interchange, but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the growth suggested in the Local Plan, but violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | | | |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152390 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 north of Holystone but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191). For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will be carried out. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152391 | Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. Violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. However, over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191) for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Those schemes that qualify for the funding will be required to prepare an Outline Business Case and carry out comprehensive public consultation, which will include the details of the junction improvements (such as pedestrian crossings). Further information of the public consultation will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | No amendments proposed. |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152399 | The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt but funding has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | <p>levels of growth suggested in the Local Plan and the Council has already been successful in accessing funding to improve the highway network directly impacted by the expected job growth. The transport impacts associated with the housing sites in emerging Local Plan would be predominantly developer funded separately and are considered in the Strategic Traffic Model (STM) – available on the Council website (http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=33571&p_subjectCategory=809). Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3</p> | |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152402 | Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. The consultation of the Local Plan coincided with the announcement that over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit of commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The Local Plan does not determine the access and egress form housing estates but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan, and will allow the opportunity for people to comment on the designs proposed by the highway engineers. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3</p> | No amendments proposed. |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152403 | Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 | | S 10.3 Transport | <p>Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? | | | for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 901558 | | RESIDENT | LP20152406 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt or north of the Holystone Interchange, but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. "Ç Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise</p> | | | <p>benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the growth suggested in the Local Plan, but violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3</p> | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | levels to existing residents? In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | | | |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152407 | In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. The Council has been successful in accessing £150million funding for improvements to the highway network. The Local Plan does not determine the detailed designs for improvements of the highway network but considers the overall transport infrastructure of the Borough. For the schemes that qualify for the £150million funding an Outline Business Case (OBC) will be prepared and submitted to the NELEP (North East Local Enterprise Partnership) for assessment and a comprehensive public consultation process will commence. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. The OBC will include a screening assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed schemes. Any impacts | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | identified as significant will be assessed in more detail and associated mitigation measures proposed where practicable, this would include air quality, noise and ecology concerns. The Full Business Case would include any environmental impact assessment required to support the scheme submission. The NELEP have indicated that the funding sort is available subject to North Tyneside Council demonstrating the scheme is good value for money and is expected to be determined and commence prior to the suggested development on the Murton site. Please note this policy number has now changed to S7.3 | |
| 901560 | | RESIDENT | LP20152408 | The current Holystone Interchange (A191/A19 Junction) is very busy and regularly at a standstill at key times during rush hour. It is also often busy at weekends. This is likely to get worse as the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass becomes busier. We would prefer for this bypass to be able to access the A 19 directly further North allowing traffic to be diverted away from the residential areas and reducing congestion and associated noise and disruption to local residents. Speeding traffic along the A191 has made pedestrian crossing more difficult particularly at peak times and in the evenings during the dark winter nights. The overall Transport infrastructure appears to hinge on the Holystone Interchange and its proposed expansion. This view appears to be quite limited and does not consider other alternatives such as a direct access to Cobalt from the A19, or routing traffic away from | | S 10.3 Transport | Comment noted. There are no proposals to create an additional junction on the A19 to Cobalt or north of the Holystone Interchange, but funding that has been identified for junction improvements to A191/A19 roundabout. These works, alongside other investment in the Boroughs highway network (including the A191), will benefit commuters, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The detailed designs of the highway network improvements will be consulted on separately to the Local Plan. Further information of the consultation process will be available on the Council website. There will need to be changes to the transport infrastructure in the Borough to meet the growth suggested in the Local Plan, but violations of speed limits within an area would not be an issue covered by planning policy. Please note this policy number has | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Holystone Interchange further North to and from the Earsdon to Holystone Interchange bypass. Access and Egress - Proposed changes to the Eastbound turning from Murrayfields and the West Allotment roundabout pose significant questions as to how this will affect traffic entering and leaving West Allotment. What impact is anticipated on traffic through the estate as a result of changing the access rights to these junctions? What impact will there be to children needing to cross the Holystone Interchange to Access Holystone Primary School? Noise- Noise Levels are already increasing particularly to houses backing onto the A191 road itself. With a proposed lane widening the traffic will be physically closer to properties and with increased commercial and residential traffic capacity noise is likely to increase. What sound and vibration studies have been carried out to date and when are future studies planned? What specific sound defences does the council propose to mitigate rising noise levels to existing residents? In simple terms the addition of one additional single lane and general widening will not address the problem, the most recent update of the Holystone Interchange from 2 lanes to 3 lanes, which was major works of approaching 12 months in duration, is already approaching capacity and is deemed in residents' eyes as not being fit for purpose. Given the now increased capacity at the junction, what impact on commuters and residents is anticipated during any planned upgrade to this junction? What plans will be put into</p> | | | now changed to S7.3. | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | place to provide alternative routes during this time for access to Cobalt Business Park? Is the upgrade planned before any works are to commence on any proposed new homes at the Murton site? | | | | |
| 794350 | | RESIDENT | LP201551 | Re. 10.21 to 10.24: Please don't build anything that will stand in the way of future bigger solutions. Gleb K. Samailov's suggestions (gleconsam on the skyscrapercity site) may be way in excess of anything affordable. It may also be untrue, that putting forward such a huge plan is necessary to get a smaller plan implemented. If a plan is too big, it will be dismissed without even being looked at. Nevertheless, the possibility of taking the Metro through a tunnel to Chichester (and beyond?) "" even if it takes 20 years of waiting to get funding "" should not be squandered altogether by short-sighted action. Any proposal for rail development south of Percy Main should keep open this long-term option. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. National guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that each local planning authority should produce a local plan for its area. The Local Plan is the planning document that not only helps decision makers determine planning applications but also sets out opportunities for development. The Local Plan should be aspirational but realistic. North Tyneside previously sought to deliver a Borough wide strategic Plan with area based plans for North Shields, Wallsend and the Coast. However, government guidance changed and the preferred approach is now for each planning authority to produce one single Plan. The North Tyneside Local Plan contains a lot of detail but we aim to make it as easy to understand. Substantial improvements to the public transport network often require long lead in times and the Local Plan has identified land to be safeguarded for such proposals in Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3). Examples include, Ashington, Blyth and Tyne Railway (Seghill - Northumberland Park - Benton); and Northumberland Park - Percy Main/Howdon Metro extension (Cobalt Corridor Link) including protection of key site at Earsdon Road, Shiremoor and sites for potential stations and access points along the route. There are no proposals for a Metro link | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | under the Tyne or for rail links south of Percy Main to the riverside, which had been previously suggested in earlier s of the Local Plan but removed based on consultation responses. | |
| 455564 | | RESIDENT | LP20152482 | With all of the proposed sites for housing in and around Benton Farm and the land adjacent to Tyne View Park etc. how does the council propose to get over traffic congestion. This is an ever increasing problem that even now leads to long queues at roundabouts and road junctions at off peak times???? | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed. |
| 892176 | | RESIDENT | LP2015245 | Please ensure adequate parking for new developments. Bear in mind that children grow up and will all want cars, no matter how "you" try to discourage this. Encourage 3-storey housing with garages on the ground floor. Ensure lots of off street parking. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. Policy DM 10.4 (now Policy DM7.4) 'New Development and Transport' sets out in criteria c) that: The number of car and cycle parking spaces provided in new developments will be in accordance with standards set out in the Transport and Highways Supplementary Planning Document (LDD12). A copy of LDD12 is available to view on the Council website - http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse-display.shtml?p_ID=514457&p_subjectCategory=811 . Policy DM10.4 does also encourage a wider transport choice by | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | ensuring that all new development is well served by an attractive choice of transport modes so that even if more people have access to a car in future there will be other attractive alternatives to using the car for every journey. | |
| 396449 | Cyclists Touring Club | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015588 | DM10.4 New Development and Transport a) footpaths should be footways. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Agreed. The suggested amendment will be made. | Amended to "footways". |
| 898219 | | | LP2015817 | Far too much congestion on the already heavily used roads | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898853 | | RESIDENT | LP2015956 | Increased access to Preston Road from many extra housing developments has caused Chronic congestion particularly at traffic heights- removing Camp Terrace traffic would help. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 587121 | Nexus | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015965 | In DM10.4 (d) there should be a stronger reference made to the requirement for developer "funding" of required transport improvements, and make mention that this could be new or enhanced bus services, minor infrastructure (bus shelters and access to these), or major infrastructure (bus-only gates, Metro stations etc). Reference is made in DM10.4 (e) that new developments near to good public transport facilities will be required to "consider" providing higher development density. We feel that this needs to be strengthened, and to also refer to commensurate reduction in car parking at such sites, rather than strict adherence to the Council's parking policy in this regard. Provision of large amounts of car parking will usually discourage public transport use and/or reduce its financial viability. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. The wording within part (d) of Policy DM10.4 (now Policy DM7.4) will be reviewed to consider if it could be reworded to 'New developments will need to demonstrate that existing or proposed public transport levels can accommodate development proposals, or where necessary, identify opportunities for public transport improvements including sustainable access to public transport transport hubs.'. The wording of criteria (e) allows for the flexibility of the policy but the wording will again be reviewed 'New developments in close proximity to public transport facilities will be required to provide a higher density of development to reflect increased opportunities for sustainable travel'. The Councils maximum parking standards are part of the Transport and Highways Supplementary Planning Document 2010, but this is currently being reviewed and due to be updated in 2015. The consultation released at the start of the year allowed for the flexibility of parking standards 'In areas with good accessibility and parking management in place a reduction in these maximum standards will be considered where it can be demonstrated that there will not be a detrimental affect on the adjacent highway | Amend criteria d) and criteria e). Include additional text in supporting paragraphs explaining Transport Assessments, Transport Statements and Travel Plans. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | safety'. The SPD does outlines the details of Transport Assessments (TA) and Transport Statements (TS) that accompany certain planning applications based on criteria from the Department of Transport. For those applications that are for a residential scheme and needing to submit a TA or a TS applicants are asked to submit a Residential Travel Plan (TP). The details of what is required from a TA, TS or TP could be further expanded in para 10.34 to strengthen the Councils commitment towards sustainable development. | |
| 898920 | Sustrans | | LP2015989 | A specific commitment to network density in new development (250m) would clarify the requirement for cycle routes. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | The Sustrans Design Manual - Handbook for cycle-friendly design advocates the development of a cycle network within urban areas so that an alternative route is never more than 250m. The Local Plan encourages a safe, convenient and accessible cycle network and this approach is favoured within Policy rather than requiring a defined distance for new development to cycle routes as it will deliver the same aims but not having to be embroiled in arguments over the justification of the distance and allowing for site specific details that could make the 250m distance unachievable. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898920 | Sustrans | | LP2015990 | Point 10.29 is inaccurate. The waggonway network on the whole offers poor quality substandard routes for walking and cycling, much is unlit and surfacing is poor and unbound. The commitment to create a walking and cycling network that is fit for purpose is missing from this document. New development requires connections that as a | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. The waggonway does provide a network of routes throughout the borough for walking and cycling but it could be further improved and therefore the 'high quality' reference has been removed. The Local Plan does support further improvements and connections to the cycling and walking network. | reference to 'high quality' deleted from paragraph 10.29 (now para 10.40) |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | minimum meet modern National Cycle Network standards and are of sufficient density to support active modes. | | | | |
| 898989 | | RESIDENT | LP20151016 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 898996 | | RESIDENT | LP20151032 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 899327 | | RESIDENT | LP20151140 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 899341 | | RESIDENT | LP20151155 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 899363 | | RESIDENT | LP20151172 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 899395 | | RESIDENT | LP20151187 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 899409 | | RESIDENT | LP20151200 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 899415 | | RESIDENT | LP20151214 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 899417 | | RESIDENT | LP20151229 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 899424 | | RESIDENT | LP20151243 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | | that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151263 | DM10.4 New Development and Transport Our Client supports the proposed policy. It is coherent with the NPPF (9) by aiming to improve the conditions in which people travel. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Support noted. | No amendments proposed |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151387 | Policy 10:4 CPRE can support this policy. Para 10:19 While CPRE welcomes reference to reopening the Ashington, Blyth and Tyne railway to passenger traffic, we find the reference rather lukewarm. We propose inclusion of an explicit policy not just safeguarding the land against a future possibility, but actively supporting and facilitating delivery of the project. Northumberland CC are not just aspiring to the project but are working closely with Network Rail and investing considerable sums, such that it may be expected that the project will be delivered within the plan period. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan is supportive of the reopening of the Ashington, Blyth and Tyne railway and it is identified in the Local Plan, specifically in Policy S10.3 (now Policy S7.3). The Local Plan can support future development but it is not the role of the Local Plan to deliver a project. However, the commitment of the Council in the Local Plan can sometimes be used to help draw down funding to assist in the delivery of projects. | No amendments proposed |
| 899754 | | RESIDENT | LP20151423 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | | this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 899791 | | RESIDENT | LP20151442 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| 899802 | | RESIDENT | LP20151463 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 899821 | | RESIDENT | LP20151477 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 899837 | | RESIDENT | LP20151507 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 899861 | | RESIDENT | LP20151522 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 899964 | | RESIDENT | LP20151570 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 899991 | Tyne and Wear Public Transport Users Group | RESIDENT | LP20151580 | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport We think that the starting point of planning new developments should be they will be, so far as possible, provided with local shops, schools and work places so as to minimise travel needs in line with the Local Transport Plan. We also want to see the development of car sharing and car clubs (co-wheels) to encourage the use of electric cars. Along with this we want to see provision of more charging points on the basis that without the infrastructure being in place people will not make the move to this better environmentally | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does recognise the potential extension of the National Cycle network with accompanying text amended to recognise the potential new national cycle route along the coast road. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan also includes a list of nine cycling schemes that are being developed with a view to exploring opportunities to secure funding for their construction as and when these arise. The majority of these routes focus on specific corridors which give access to employment destinations – e.g. A19 | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | friendly means of travel. The big failing in the plan is that it does not define where the borough's main utility cycling routes should be. The three existing national cycle network routes are shown on the map, but these date from ten years ago, so where is the ambition to complete a network? We want to see all new public transport, including good walking paths , cycling paths, metro stations and bus stops etc all in place before shops and other facilities are in put place. 10.22 We want to see all the land safeguarded for the option of a heavy rail link referred to re the Port of Tyne. 10.28 We would like to see the restoration of a ferry link with Norway. | | | corridor, A1058 Coast Road corridor. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan also references the North Tyneside's Cycling Strategy, adopted in 2010, and a revised Cycling Strategy is to be developed which will set out how a future vision for cycling will be secured in the Borough. This information all helps shape the Local Plan which aims to deliver sustainable development. Policy DM6.11, S10.3 and DM10.4 (now Policies DM3.1, S7.3 and DM7.4) outline the Councils approach to minimise the need to travel and encourage the use of electric cars. The restoration of a ferry service to Norway falls outside the role of the Local Plan but the benefits of this route are referenced in Policy S5.1 (now Policy S2.1). Comments relating to para 10.22 are noted but at this time a rail link is not currently considered necessary to support the economic development of the Port of Tyne, however, the possibility that this land may benefit from a new rail link to support freight movement to and from the north bank at some point in the future cannot be totally discounted. | |
| 900011 | | RESIDENT | LP20151599 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 900085 | | RESIDENT | LP20151624 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 900141 | | RESIDENT | LP20151668 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 900165 | | RESIDENT | LP20151687 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152054 | Policy DM10.4 seeks improvement to accessibility and highways via new developments. This policy seems reasonable in all aspects with the exception of sub criteria (f) which sets a requirement for electricity charging points on "appropriate" | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. Further evidence on the viability work to accompany the Local Plan will be made available once it is published. Policy reflects NPPF para 35 to exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes and 'incorporate facilities | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | developments. Firstly this policy does not state what the criteria would be for an "appropriate" development and secondly no evidence has been forthcoming of the need or justification of new charging points associated with developments. Finally as with the rest of this representation no evidence has been provided that the viability of developments and the cumulative or individual impacts of these policies has been considered. | | | for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles'. | |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152186 | Paragraph 10.33 -given that a number of highway structures are also heritage assets, their maintenance would, if managed correctly, form part of a positive strategy for the historic environment in line with the NPPF. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901541 | | RESIDENT | LP20152348 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 901549 | | RESIDENT | LP20152359 | The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed. |
| 901556 | | RESIDENT | LP20152371 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 901563 | | RESIDENT | LP20152378 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. Noise vibrations from roads nearby to nearby property. Safety concerns if A191 widened as will bring traffic closer to houses. Crash safety barriers not in place. Paths exposed to traffic. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 901564 | | RESIDENT | LP20152379 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. Noise vibrations from roads nearby to nearby property. Safety concerns if A191 widened as will bring traffic closer to houses. Crash safety barriers not in place. Paths exposed to traffic. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 901572 | | RESIDENT | LP20152400 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 901558 | | RESIDENT | LP20152413 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. Property Prices - Direct affect there on | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 901560 | | RESIDENT | LP20152414 | Safety- The increase in traffic in both directions on the A191 particularly on the Eastmost side of the Holystone interchange has required additional crossing and traffic calming measures. Further development and potential increase in road capacity places significant questions as to ongoing pedestrian and road safety. Property Prices - Direct affect there on | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including along the A191) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed |
| 808138 | | RESIDENT | LP20152429 | Serious consideration should be given to solving the traffic congestion that arises at rush hour and peak times during the day with traffic entering and leaving the confines of the Cobalt Business Park and the Silverlink. The local omnibus operators have had to alter their timetables at certain times of the day due to the severe congestion of traffic at various times of the day, resulting in the knock on effects of delayed public transportation. With hindsight these | | DM 10.4 New Development and Transport | Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network (including around the Cobalt business park) for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists | No amendments proposed |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | <p>problems should have been addressed when Cobalt was originally developed.</p> <p>On the afternoon of Thursday 2nd April last, the traffic came very close to gridlock with the A191 blocked from the A19 to the B1316 including Norham Road North, the B1322, also the Silverlink North including Silverfox Way, Middle Engine Lane both ways and the Silverlink to the A1058. This occurrence brought out the best in some of the motorists who decided the laws of the road did not apply to them, trying to do 3 point turns, blocking exits and lanes they did not want to be in. This resulted in a (30) minute bus journey from Newcastle to New York taking one hour and forty minutes (1hr 40mins). This is now becoming a regular occurrence and needs to be addressed before the new housing development to be built on Shiremoor/Murton greenfield site with the large increase of motor vehicles that will accompany this development.</p> | | | and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | |
| 878767 | | | LP201519 | <p>It is pleasing to note that Paragraph 10.39 states "The Council recognises the importance of car parking to support the local economy." It is therefore suggested that Policy statement AS10.5 is amended to include a comment such as "explore the benefits of introducing a single daily parking charge that would permit visitors to use any or several different parking locations on the same day across the coastal area - a daily parking pass. In addition to consider the introduction of a yearly parking pass for residents to enable them to use any or several different parking locations across the coastal area without having to buy a ticket</p> | | AS 10.5 Coastal Transport | <p>Whilst North Tyneside Planning department has no control over parking tickets and permits, North Tyneside Council does have a Foreshore Permit which in the past has allowed people to park in more than one place within the same day along our coastline. This permit is currently under review. For anymore information please contact the parking control team: parkingcontrol@northtyneside.gov.uk.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | for each site on the day." This parking development would then encourage visitors and residents to visit and use more of the facilities located throughout the coastal area. | | | | |
| 805724 | | LANDOWNER / BUSINESS | LP2015279 | Horton Estate consider this policy needs to be more focused and in particular criterion f. The policy and in particular criterion f is wide ranging and extends beyond Whitley Bay town centre and its immediate surroundings. Within Whitley Bay town centre and its immediate surroundings Horton Estate support the policy but consider it should not be applicable in St Mary's Headland. In this respect emerging policy AS5.9 refers to new visitor facilities at St Mary's Headland. A possible location for these could be a portion of the existing car park and compensatory car parking might not be appropriate or desirable acknowledging other policy aims and coastal green links. | | AS 10.5 Coastal Transport | Comment noted. The importance of car parking is a key consideration to those wishing to visit the coast and is seen as key factor in supporting economic opportunities at the coast. Maintaining the level of car parking at the coast has been a clear aspiration of previous consultation events and the policy is a reflection of this. The Local Plan will consider amendments to Policy 10.5 (now Policy AS8.23) and whether greater flexibility to support alternative sustainable forms of transport to access the coast if car parking sites were to be lost. | Introduction of the Policy amended to read 'Through working in partnership the Council aims to improve the accessibility of the coastal area that will:' The final criterion (f), has been amended to maintain the car parking at the coast but also seeking to support other sustainable forms of transport - 'Maintain adequate car parking provision that serves the coast with improved access for sustainable transport that would cause no adverse impacts on people, biodiversity and the environment.' |
| 396449 | Cyclists Touring Club | OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION | LP2015589 | AS10.5 Coastal Transport b. remove the words consideration of. c. add the word motor before vehicle (this is because a cycle is a vehicle). | | AS 10.5 Coastal Transport | Agreed. The deletion of 'consideration of' from criteria (b) and include the word 'motor' before vehicle in criteria (c). | Agreed. The deletion of 'consideration of' from criteria (b) and include the word 'motor' before vehicle in criteria (c). |
| 587121 | Nexus | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015967 | Support for Metro and bus access to Wallsend town centre is welcome. However, in the Coast section, policy AS10.5 proposes both to reduce car access to Whitley Bay town centre, and increase town centre car parking or alternate nearby sites; we believe that these policies have the potential to conflict with | | AS 10.5 Coastal Transport | Comment noted. The intention of the Policy is to create a more attractive town centre for Whitley Bay by reducing the impact of cars travelling through the centre but recognising that car parking is an important issue that supports businesses. It is considered that both could be achieved but | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | each other. | | | would require detailed designs and modelling to assess the potential impact of any future scheme. | |
| 898920 | Sustrans | | LP2015991 | As is the case with many suburban centres there is confusion between poorly managed car parking and the availability of car parking. Better management can and should improve availability without seeing the negative impact on walking and cycling access to town centres that the existing car parking strategy has created. Surface car parking in town centres can blight the town and reduce the attractiveness of the retail offer, the policies fail to recognise this. | | AS 10.5 Coastal Transport | Comment noted. The Policy does not specify surface car parking but does refer to improving the environmental quality of streets within Whitley Bay. However, the Policy will be amended to ensure car parking enhances the quality of the environment of the area. | Criteria (e) amended to include 'that also enhance the quality of the environment' |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151388 | Policy AS10:5 Coastal Transport. CPRE broadly supports this policy. More explicit support for non-car modes of transport (incl the Metro) would be appropriate. | | AS 10.5 Coastal Transport | Comment noted. The Local Plan will consider amendments to Policy 10.5 (now Policy AS8.23) and whether greater flexibility to support alternative sustainable forms of transport to access the coast if car parking sites were to be lost. | The final criterion (f), has been amended to maintain the car parking at the coast but also seeking to support other sustainable forms of transport - 'Maintain adequate car parking provision that serves the coast with improved access for sustainable transport that would cause no adverse impacts on people, biodiversity and the environment.' |
| 899991 | Tyne and Wear Public Transport Users Group | RESIDENT | LP20151581 | 10.5 Coastal transport We think that it is vital for both environmental commercial reasons that a safe and comfortable cycle route is established for the full length of the coast and this includes proper separation from pedestrians. along the coast. We need better policing of poor parking especially we need to have better double yellow lines to improve | | AS 10.5 Coastal Transport | Comment noted. Policy AS1.5 (now policy AS8.15) does identify the improvement and development of sustainable transport links to encourage public transport, cycling and walking in the Coastal area. Policy AS10.5 (now policy AS8.23) has a more specific focus of connections to Whitley Bay and the importance of cycling and walking is | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | sight lines for cyclists and drivers and pedestrians. | | | identified in criteria (a), (b), and (c). Policy S10.3 (now policy S7.3) seeks to develop improvements to cycle routes including the national cycle network that runs along the seafront but the intention is to maintain a shared surface for pedestrians and cyclists on certain sections of the promenade. | |
| 899991 | Tyne and Wear Public Transport Users Group | RESIDENT | LP20151582 | 10.5 Coastal transport We think that it is vital for both environmental commercial reasons that a safe and comfortable cycle route is established for the full length of the coast and this includes proper separation from pedestrians. along the coast. We need better policing of poor parking especially we need to have better double yellow lines to improve sight lines for cyclists and drivers and pedestrians. | | AS 10.5 Coastal Transport | Comment noted. Policy AS1.5 (now policy AS8.15) does identify the improvement and development of sustainable transport links to encourage public transport, cycling and walking in the Coastal area. Policy AS10.5 (now policy AS8.23) has a more specific focus of connections to Whitley Bay and the importance of cycling and walking is identified in criteria (a), (b), and (c). Policy S10.3 (now policy S7.3) seeks to develop improvements to cycle routes including the national cycle network that runs along the seafront but the intention is to maintain a shared surface for pedestrians and cyclists on certain sections of the promenade. | No amendments proposed. |
| 510094 | Natural England | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151963 | Natural England supports the requirement of this policy to be compliant with policy DM8.6 in order to ensure that there are no adverse effects on internationally designated sites. | | AS 10.5 Coastal Transport | Support noted | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152187 | Paragraph 10.37- Whitley Bay town centre is described as compact. I would question this if the secondary shopping areas are included. | | AS 10.5 Coastal Transport | Comment noted. Paragraph 10.36 and 10.37 (now paras 11.97 and 11.98) amended and the sentence in question has been deleted. | Amend Para 10.36 and 10.37 (now paras 11.97 and 11.98). Also amend criteria c) from 'continue' to 'seek' |
| 587121 | Nexus | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP2015966 | Support for Metro and bus access to Wallsend town centre is welcome. | | AS 10.6 Wallsend: Transport and Accessibility in the Town | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | Centre | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151389 | Policy AS10:6. Wallsend. CPRE can support this policy. | | AS 10.6 Wallsend: Transport and Accessibility in the Town Centre | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899991 | Tyne and Wear Public Transport Users Group | RESIDENT | LP20151583 | Wallsend Sub Area On the basis of conversations we have had with residents we are not certain that Wallsend and Willington Quay have good public transport connections. There is little doubt that people living within easy reach of either Metro or the Coast Road have good connections both to the Coast and to Newcastle. What is less certain is that they have good connections to other parts of North Tyneside. We have noted that Go Ahead have recently reduced the frequency of some of the services they offer that within North Tyneside and think that the time has come for a full study to be done of transport needs and links within North Tyneside. We think that a commitment to such a study should be included in the plan. | | AS 10.6 Wallsend: Transport and Accessibility in the Town Centre | This comment is noted and has been shared with the North Tyneside Transport Planning Team. The need for constant and ongoing measures to encourage improvements to public transport provision is recognised through the transport policies of the Local Plan. With specific reference to Wallsend whilst it is acknowledged there may be specific locations and challenges to access overall, as is pointed out within the comment the area is well served by the Metrol, which provides access not only to the coast but 17 stations across North Tyneside. Meanwhile, bus routes provide access from Wallsend to locations less well served by the Metro such as Cobalt Business Park, Quorum and Killingworth. A commitment to such a study specifically linked to Wallsend and Willington Quay is therefore not considered an appropriate criteria within policy of the Local Plan. | No amendments proposed |
| 891828 | | RESIDENT | LP2015208 | Main Street through Dudley cannot take more traffic. Far too busy with traffic cutting through. Not safe for children especially on school runs. Meadowbank has problems with motorcycles cutting through to Annitsford and taxi drop-off through cut to Annitsford. This will be increased with housing on | | AS 10.7 Sustainable transport and traffic management for the North West | Comments noted. This policy recognises issues such as this and sets out that traffic calming should be explored in the area. Any housing proposals would be assessed for their potential impact on the road network. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | Annitsford Farm. | | | | |
| 898030 | | | LP2015697 | <p>Although the North West is "well-served by the local major road network, with the A1, A19 and A189 all within or having junctions in the North West area" it is also a nightmare at peak times with the traffic congestion from the A19 Killingworth\Seghill junction all the way through to the A1 Gosforth Park junction. Before extra houses\employment opportunities are introduced into the North West can I suggest that this route through the North West is improved? Villages such as Camperdown, Burradon & Annitsford are plagued with commuter traffic all trying to escape the congestion. I have seen the plans for the proposed changes to the A1056 Sandy Lane but I don't believe this will alleviate the congestion. Putting traffic light operated junctions at either end will just slow the traffic down further and the A19 Killingworth\Seghill junction is an accident blackspot with far too many left\right blindspot turns in a short space of road. This junction needs replacing urgently. Also, public transport is not an option for most commuters in this area as we have no quick & direct access to the metro network, no local trains so can only rely on the bus network. The buses seem to be getting more infrequent and the routes they take are congested anyway so it is not a viable option for regular commuting.</p> | | AS 10.7 Sustainable transport and traffic management for the North West | <p>Comment noted. One of the key elements of the Local Plan is to understand the impact of the levels of growth suggested and within this is the impact of the transport system. The Council have been successful in securing grant funding for highway improvements that mean over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. The Highways Agency is responsible for works to be carried out on the A19 and A1, and the Council is responsible for works on A189. The Seghill A1/A19 roundabout has received funding for a road widening scheme and the A189 has funding secured for junction improvements as part of the overall £150million funding package. The provision of bus routes is primarily a decision taken by bus companies and NEXUS but the Local Plan does support the improved public transport provision for the North West in stipulating the importance to safeguard and improve the areas bus service and aim to discourage 'rat runs' of people avoiding the</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | congested main routes. There are no plans to extend the Metro service or local train service to the North West. | |
| 898525 | | RESIDENT | LP2015827 | <p>The road, B1505, is also an issue when considering development of Site 142. Though, perhaps officially unreported, there have been several traffic incidents on this road. Frequently used by motorists trying to avoid congestion on the A189, this is already quite a busy road as the latest of several traffic calming measures contest. Traffic can only increase with the opening of the new emergency hospital at Cramlington later this year and the possibility of more motorists from the large development Site Reference 3 proposed in your Consultation plan. The potential hazard to residents, particularly children, crossing from houses on the proposed site to Front St. has to be obvious especially since the return journey might well require crossing from behind cars parked outside the general dealers and fast food outlets on Front Street. While details of the building line for the proposed development are not available, pollution, and its possible effects, from traffic on the A189 have also to be considered. Though there are already houses to the south of Site 142 and their occupants may be quite willing to live in such close proximity to this busy dual carriageway, any houses on the proposed development, especially the northern end, would be exposed to greater levels of pollution from stationary traffic queuing at traffic lights on the A189, particularly during rush hour periods. It's not a place I would want to live!</p> | | AS 10.7 Sustainable transport and traffic management for the North West | <p>Comment noted. Policy DM10.4 (now policy DM7.4) does outlines a set of criteria to be taken into account with new development, but the details of the access and site layout for Site 142 will be determined at the planning application stage. Pollution is an issue that the Local Plan recognises, with a policy on Pollution that is designed to protect both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of pollution. The Council is therefore seeking to require development to comply with national standards and adopt techniques to prevent, minimise or render harmless polluting substances. Development proposed where pollution levels are unacceptable will not be permitted unless it is possible for mitigation measures to be introduced to secure a satisfactory living or working environment.</p> | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151264 | AS10.7 Sustainable transport and traffic management for the North West Our Client supports the proposed policy, in particular "d. Explore appropriate traffic calming measures in the North West villages, with the aim of discouraging "rat runs" to avoid congested main routes'. By implementing traffic calming measures in congested locations this will improve travelling conditions (NPPF, 9) and by implementing further public transport and increasing sustainable transport methods, such as increased ability to walk and cycle, this will reduce the need to travel via car (NPPF, 29). | | AS 10.7 Sustainable transport and traffic management for the North West | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151390 | Policy AS10:7. CPRE can support this policy but urges the need to protect wildlife corridors. | | AS 10.7 Sustainable transport and traffic management for the North West | Comments noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899991 | Tyne and Wear Public Transport Users Group | RESIDENT | LP20151584 | North West Communities We are aware of many locally expressed concerns about the lack of routes and links available to people living in Seaton Burn, Wideopen, Weetslade and Dudley. Our point about a proper study of these problems that engages local communities and aims to map out what is needed, made in our comments above on the Wallsend sub area, applies equally to these parts of the North West. 10.48 This should apply to every locality 10.49 We are very pleased that this may now happen as it has been an aspiration of TWPTUG. | | AS 10.7 Sustainable transport and traffic management for the North West | Comments noted. This comment is noted and has been shared with the North Tyneside Transport Planning Team. The need for constant and ongoing measures to encourage improvements to public transport provision is recognised through the transport policies of the Local Plan. We are working with Nexus and public transport suppliers to ensure that all transport requirements arising from the Plan's proposals are recognised and delivered. | No amendments proposed |
| 685823 | North Tyneside | | LP20151107 | Green Party We support this policy and look forward to seeing some detail and practical | | DM 10.8 Renewable | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | Green Party | | | encouragement for the development of community energy schemes. | | Energy and Low Carbon Technologies | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151391 | Policy DM10:8 CPRE welcomes this policy | | DM 10.8 Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technologies | Support noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152055 | Policy DM10.8 sets out the Councils aims in relation to carbon and renewable energy solutions. Persimmon does not have a direct objection to this policy however we have the following concerns. The application of this policy to new developments is clearly held through policy DM9.1 and the same concerns as raised for that policy apply here. | | DM 10.8 Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technologies | Comments noted. Policy Dm9.1 has been removed from the Local Plan. | No amendments proposed. |
| 396269 | English Heritage | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20152188 | Policy SM 10.8 -whilst it is important to promote the use of renewable and low-carbon energy technologies wherever possible, this policy should extol sequentially the role of non intrusive energy conservation measures in preference to any form of energy consumption. | | DM 10.8 Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technologies | The Local Plan sets out design policies that address of low impact energy conservation such as use of layout to maximise passive solar gain. This policy refers specifically to support for the installation of renewable and low carbon technology. | No amendments proposed. |
| 892139 | | RESIDENT | LP2015242 | I suggest the Council look to repair drains in Murton Village after being flooded two times badly. £50,000 damage - 2005 to 2012. | | S 10.9 Water Management | Comment noted. The Council are currently carrying out drainage schemes in the Murton Area and further investigation will be undertaken in association with any development at Murton | No amendments proposed |
| 396306 | South Tyneside Council, | LOCAL AUTHORITY | LP2015465 | Finally, we wholly support Policies S10.9 and DM10.10 and their supporting text regarding the strategic need to invest in sustainably managing surface water, and thus waste water and sewage capacity at the Howdon Sewage Treatment Works, in order to ensure the headroom necessary to support future development in the cross-boundary | | S 10.9 Water Management | Comment noted. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | catchment area. | | | | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151392 | Policy S10:9. Water management. CPRE broadly supports this policy but has concerns about the effectiveness of SuDS. We welcome the requirement for "whole lifetime management" . We are concerned about the cumulative impact of multiple SuDS schemes both under normal operation and on the risk of a "domino effect" catastrophic failure. We are aware of the tension between effective drainage and the maintenance of wildlife corridors. | | S 10.9 Water Management | Comment noted. | None rquired. |
| 807164 | Northumbrian Water Ltd | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151805 | With reference to the supporting text of Policy S10.9, we believe that there is an opportunity for further emphasis upon water conservation alongside commentary regarding water supply and current availability in paragraph 10.55. Climate change and development pressure are rightly identified as key influences upon future water resources and wastewater treatment capabilities, however it is our opinion that this text should go further in highlighting the need for the careful use of water resources into the future. Furthermore, we would suggest stronger wording is assigned to the status of Howdon STW and the importance of surface water separation schemes. The current sentence in paragraph 10.56 states that "surface water, which currently flows into the sewerage systems, needs to ideally be removed'. It is our opinion that this language is not sufficiently pro-active in encouraging new development to embrace the principles of sustainable water management and | | S 10.9 Water Management | Comments noted and amendments will be made. | Water sections of Local Plan have been combined and re-written. NWL were re-consulted on these changes and have agreed them. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>consequently contribute towards increased capacity in the sewerage network and at Howdon STW. We recognise that the wording around the subject in Policy S10.9 is much more effective, however we would suggest the revision of supporting text to portray a consistent message. With regard to Policy S10.9 specifically, we welcome the coordinated approach to water management and will again continue our existing role in working with the Council and others to manage water resources, wastewater treatment and drainage infrastructure. We strongly support point "a' and we commend North Tyneside Council for recognising the importance of ensuring that appropriate infrastructure is provided in tandem with new development. We welcome consultation with developers as early as possible in the development process to ensure capacity in the network for future developments, and that where any improvements are necessary they are planned and implemented in a timely manner. With regard to point "b', specifically, whilst we welcome the requirement to incorporate sustainable drainage systems within all new developments, the preceding wording relating to surface water runoff is slightly confusing. We believe this phrase may intend to refer to sustainable surface water separation, and we would suggest that the sentence is revised to clearly reflect this. Moving on to the subsequent statement in S10.9, we believe that North Tyneside Council must take a stronger position in the requirement for</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>sustainable drainage systems in new development. The provision of "clear justification' from developers is considered to threaten the approach to sustainable drainage otherwise outlined in the policy. It is our opinion that sustainable drainage systems should be excluded only in exceptional circumstances, and that there should be a requirement to provide robust evidence to demonstrate the reasons that sustainable drainage systems cannot be incorporated. Additionally, we have concerns regarding the use of the phrases "where practicable' and "where practicable and suitable' throughout this section, as we consider that this could be grounds for a viability argument from developers, in a period when ensuring sustainable surface water management is becoming increasingly critical in the provision of infrastructure services for new development. We fully support the final paragraph of S10.9, which offers valuable guidance to developers relating to water supply and wastewater infrastructure. We strongly advocate the principle of "avoid, minimise and control' with regard to surface water disposal, and welcome the clear links between surface water disposal, sewerage capacity and headroom at Howdon STW set out in this policy. Having said this, we suggest that supporting paragraph 10.57, which currently follows Policy S10.9, would form an effective introductory section prior to the policy wording or perhaps more importantly that the second half of the paragraph should be incorporated into the body of the policy, as</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | this text contains the critical message relating to sustainable surface water management: To ensure that growth can be accommodated sustainably by the water infrastructure, the policy requires that in all locations surface water should be separated, with any surface water runoff entering the sewerage system being minimised and controlled. The priority is to avoid using public sewers wherever possible for the disposal of surface water. If connection to the public sewerage network is the only option, there is a need for on site mitigation to attenuate surface water to minimise and control surface water flows. | | | | |
| 789566 | Environment Agency | GOVERNMENT AGENCY | LP20151827 | We support the inclusion of a flood risk and sustainable drainage policies. We welcome that Policy DM/8.12 has been further strengthened through adding a requirement to avoid development within areas at risk of flooding. In addition we support that the policy now seeks development should manage flood risk from all sources, taking into account the impact of climate change over its lifetime. Strand c) of the policy seeks to ensure that "there is no net increase in surface water run off" . We maintain that this policy should be amended to reflect issues outlined in North Tyneside's Water Cycle Study (WCS) and Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP). As outlined in 10.57 and the WCS there currently is insufficient capacity at Howdon Sewerage Treatment Works (HSTW) to accommodate the increased foul drainage from the planned housing and employment growth. NWL are currently working on a Sustainable Sewerage Strategy across Tyne | | S 10.9 Water Management | Comments noted, the water sections have been significantly rewritten and subsequently EA have been reconsulted. | Water sections have been combined and re written. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>and Wear which will help remove surface water from sewers. Although this will help increase capacity at HSTW this will not free up sufficient capacity to accommodate all planned growth. Surface water is seen as both the problem and a solution to freeing up capacity at HSTW and enabling sustainable growth. The key to increasing capacity would be to take surface water out of the sewerage network - on this basis, we recommend that the policy reflects these requirements. In removing surface water from the sewer network careful consideration must be given to ensure that surface water does not increase flood risk elsewhere. On this basis, the requirement of "no net increase" may not be sufficiently reflect these issues. DM 10.10 seeks to limit post development run off rates to a maximum of 50% of the flows. We consider cross referencing of these policies is required to avoid confusion. You will know that the Government has announced that it intends to change our statutory consultee duties for planning applications. This also means making Lead Local Flood Authorities statutory consultees for surface water drainage issues for "'major' developments. This will need a change to the Development Management Procedure Order (DMPO). A new DMPO which includes these changes and consolidates the original DMPO and amendments made to it was recently published and will come into force on 15th April 2015. To support the new consultation arrangements, DCLG has changed the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The main</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>changes are to the pages: Why are sustainable drainage systems important? How the local planning authority should involve the lead local flood authority when determining planning applications and what advice should be given about local flood risks Water supply , wastewater and water quality considerations in plan-making This guidance provides clarity on when SUDs are appropriate, together with minimum standards of operation and the need that there are clear arrangements in place for ongoing maintenance. On this basis, we consider it is essential that the Policy outlines the LPA's position and expectations "" particularly regarding maintenance and adoption of SUDS. The PPG further highlights that SUDS provide opportunities to: "ç reduce the causes and impacts of flooding; "ç remove pollutants from urban run-off at source; "ç combine water management with green space with benefits for amenity, recreation and wildlife. Given this emphasis of the wider benefits of flood risk, we consider that this policy can be strengthened to highlight the water quality, amenity, recreation and wildlife benefits. As previously highlighted a number of recent planning applications have proposed direct deep drainage discharges of surface water to the bedrock. These have been particularly problematic at Algernon "" we welcome that the policy recognises deep drainage structures are unsuitable in this area. Mine water levels are currently actively managed across the Local Authority area. On this basis, we consider that such techniques</p> | | | | |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | | do not provide a sustainable, long term solution due to rising groundwater levels reducing the storage capacity which may lead to groundwater flooding elsewhere. Discharges that concentrate the flow of effluent at one location and bypass some of the soil layers will limit the ability of the ground to attenuate pollutants and protect groundwater. Direct input into groundwater presents a significantly increased risk of pollution. We are seeking to stop cases where discharges are directly into the groundwater through wells, boreholes and shafts. The level of prior examination required to support a proposal to use a borehole may be significantly greater than required for near surface infiltration systems. An environmental permit may be required. On this basis, we would recommend that the asterisk highlights that deep drainage structures are unlikely to be suitable anywhere in the Authority area. | | | | |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152056 | Policy's S10.9 and DM10.10 set out the Council's approach towards water and drainage management. While we support in principle these policies we would advise as commented in response to policy DM9.1 applies in this case also. Policy DM 9.1 sets out the authority's policy on sustainable design and construction. Sustainable construction and design is something that Persimmon are heavily involved with at a local and national level. We are aware that National government are pulling together all previous requirements in terms of Code for Sustainable Homes, lifetime homes and Zero Carbon initiatives into the existing Building | | S 10.9 Water Management | Comments noted and amendments will be made. | Policy 9.1 has now been deleted |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|---------|------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | | Regulations structure to which all new developments are beholden regardless. This policy as currently worded is objected to for the above and following reasons: Sub-criteria (a) within this policy seeks additional requirements over and above national building regulations which we object to. In addition the policy wording sets a requirement of "exploring opportunities for renewable energy" and that this should be done via the submission of a Sustainability Statement. While the requirement for this statement is normal and correct how an applicant would go about "exploring opportunities for" within a statement is questionable and seems contrary to the requirements of the NPPF. | | | | |
| 805689 | | | LP2015901 | Overall, I believe the plan is good. It is well written and well laid out - although as is the nature of these things - a huge task to read through. However, I've enjoyed reading it - I've learnt more about my area and more about why we need the plan. I am in agreement with your proposed programme to monitor progress with flexibility for possible future change and processes to identify problems and find solutions. Except, throughout the whole plan - even in the section regarding waste management - I have not seen a single reference to the current litter epidemic and how it will be tackled. With six weeks or so until the elections, I would be delighted to see you take action. I can see so many opportunities for the Council to gain more support and really make North Tyneside look and feel as good as we know it | | S 11.1 Monitoring and Local Plan Implementation | Comments noted. The Planning system primarily deals with the built environment. The Local Plan contains a policy to ensure that new developments provide sustainable waste management (during construction and use) through the provision of recycling facilities and ensure a suitable location for the storage and collection of waste" (policy DM7.9 New Development and Waste). The Local Plan also has to include policies on the facilities and land associated with waste management. However the Local Plan or Planning system are otherwise not able to manage litter and therefore we cannot include a monitoring indicator on the topic. The Council have a Streetcare team who deal with litter issues and they are aware of your concerns. Residents are encouraged to report issues by calling the team or via an | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | is - UNDERNEATH ALL THE LITTER!!! :-) | | | online form: http://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/403/report-untidy-streets-and-overflowing-litter-bins | |
| 809185 | CPRE | NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION | LP20151394 | Policy S11:1. CPRE supports this policy. | | S 11.1 Monitoring and Local Plan Implementation | Support for Implementation and Monitoring policy noted. | No amendments proposed. |
| 830571 | Persimmon Homes | DEVELOPER | LP20152057 | Policy S11.1 sets out the Council's monitoring and implementation policy. This policy is supported and seems logical and supported by evidence. We would however advise that the final sanction to a failing plan (if identified by AMR) would be an early plan review process. We suggest that this is included as an additional action in response to this scenario. This links with our response highlighted above in relation to policy S3.1 in relation to Green Belt. | | S 11.1 Monitoring and Local Plan Implementation | It is acknowledged that there are a number of fundamental issues which could necessitate a review of the plan. This position needs to be reviewed throughout the plan period through appropriate monitoring indicators, with the triggers which would necessitate a further review highlighted and the contingency measures outlined. The Implementation and Monitoring section will be further developed to reflect this, including in outlining what triggers would set about a plan review process and how the Council will respond. | Policy S11.1 (now 9.1), text added: "If the measures outlined in the criteria above prove to be insufficient, or are otherwise unable to overcome the barriers to delivery of the overall objectives and strategy, then the Council will consider the need for a partial of full review of the Local Plan" |
| 590341 | | | LP2015191 | what penalties are imposed if the plan[s] are not implemented? | | Implementation and Monitoring 11 | Without a Local Plan, decisions about planning applications do not consider local circumstances and priorities, just national guidance. Without a Local Plan, we are less likely to be able to successfully reject planning applications that we believe are wrong for North Tyneside. A Local Plan allows us to plan more strategically, such as the proposed masterplans at Killingworth and Murton, rather than respond to piecemeal development. | No amendments proposed. |
| 898630 | | | LP20151276 | Who, both on the council and the councillors involved, will take responsibility if your | | Implementation and | The local plan and its evidence is fully endorsed by all members of the Council. | No amendments proposed. |

| Person ID | Company | Respondent Group | Comment ID | All Comments | Site Ref | Section or Policy | Officer Response | Amendments made |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | | | projections are wrong and we unnecessarily build on greenfield sites? Also, the process should be transparent in that the citizens of North Tyneside should know who grants what planning permission and which councillors vote for what. | | Monitoring 11 | Planning committee is always open to all members of the public who can witness at first hand the voting process. | |
| 891027 | | | LP2015189 | The proposal to squeeze more homes into green belt land at Killingworth Moor and Murton will only exacerbate the already serious road transportation issues to the east and west of the A19 corridor. Tinkering with the existing road transportation plans will be insufficient in meeting the extra demands and is unsustainable. So whilst the council wish to attract new business and create more jobs I fear the proposals will have the opposite effect and turn business away due to the inability for their workforce and goods/services to move in and out of the borough. | | Interpreting the Spatial Strategy through Delivery of the Plan | Comment noted. Over the next five years around £150million is set to be invested in the Boroughs highway network for the benefit for public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction improvements in the Borough will aim to make it easier and safer to travel and have reflected the expected job growth and not the housing sites associated with the emerging Local Plan for which any additional highway improvements would be predominantly developer funded separately. | No amendments proposed. |
| 899444 | George F White | | LP20151298 | 4 A sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside (4.5) The sub-division of the plan area into "'Strategic Policy Areas' would benefit from further clarity on Map 2 and the proposals map. The extent of the "'Urban Fringe Area' is unclear, this requires a boundary line to make it clear where the "'Urban Fringe' is differentiated from the remaining "'Main Urban Area'. | | Interpreting the Spatial Strategy through Delivery of the Plan | Comment noted. Maps and the Strategic Policy Areas will be clarified. | Revised Map produced to show strategic policy areas |