

## **APPENDIX 2:**

### **North Tyneside Local Plan Consultation Draft 2013 Full Response Schedule**

**Meeting:** Overview, Scrutiny and Policy Development

**Date:** 1<sup>st</sup> December 2014

**Title:** North Tyneside Local Plan – Further Consultation Draft

---

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
792059	RESIDENT	LPCD221	0	You need to have an overall grand plan	1 Introduction
801358	RESIDENT	LPCD2678	0	I wish to object to the proposed building work and in particular, on the land surrounding Murton Village. 1) The surrounding roads are incapable of taking the extra traffic. 2) The landscape will be ruined for ever. 3) The area is a wildlife corridor which would be lost forever. 4) People have chosen to live where they do because North Tyneside is currently a great place to live, this will not be the case if all this building is allowed to go ahead. 5) Health services and schools in the area already struggle to cope with the numbers of residents in the area, without an extra 240 plus homes. 6) If I wanted to live on a major highway, I would have purchased a home on one, I have no wish to be forced into it. 7) The land is currently in full use as crop growing fields, building on this land means less crops. 8) The fields regularly flood.	1 Introduction
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3261	0	With regard to pint 1.17 neighbouring boroughs having an impact on North Tyneside consideration must be given to the empty office buildings all over Newcastle. Newcastle is no more than 40 minutes journey by metro for most North Tyneside residents. So employment opportunities exist there. All empty office and shop buildings in North Tyneside and the neighbouring boroughs should be filled before building more.	1 Introduction
586329	RESIDENT	LPCD2879	0	Brown field sites should be developed first. If there remains a need to develop green field sites, then this needs to be done in the context of site sustainability, along with recent / current developments. There has been far too much focus on areas around the Rising Sun Country Park which were never sustainable, along with West Moor. This will cause irreversible damage to wildlife and total destruction of major wildlife corridors and should never have been in the previous plan (aka Core Strategy). The previous plan (aka Core Strategy) had the most sustainable green field site removed from it - the area around Murton. Clearly the residents of Murton would not be happy and do not wish to shoulder their share of developments in the borough but it IS the most sustainable green field site in North Tyneside, as identified by the Council's own officers. It adjoins a new dualled road system linking it to the A19. It also has a Metro line running through it and a new station could be built in the middle of the site to reduce the need for road transport. It also has significant school places available close by, particularly in the Secondary sector at Monkseaton High School. It is not public access land, so there is no real loss of civic amenity. Please, encourage developers to use brown field sites first, but if there is a need for green field, Murton has to be the first one to be developed.	1 Introduction
805053	RESIDENT	LPCD3105	0	Also if you do not have sufficient plans in place you will get more unwanted housing being won on appeal.	1 Introduction
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4924	0	Although the RSS has been abolished by central government it must surely be largely incorporated into the this Local Plan - as it must be still relevant.	1 Introduction
805780	RESIDENT	LPCD4110	0	I am writing with regards to the North Tyneside Local Plan: Consultation Draft Summary Document that we received through our door in November 2013. I would like to express my disappointment in receiving the leaflet AFTER the Weekday & Saturday drop-in sessions where we were welcomed to	1 Introduction

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				discuss the draft with a planning officer.	
806103	RESIDENT	LPCD4294	0	I am extremely concerned about the manner of consultation since I have learned about the 6 January deadline for objections only today, 5th January, and feel this represents an attempt to circumnavigate the democratic process. North Tyneside is part of a large conurbation that simply has to act with 'joined up' thinking and planning.	1 Introduction
806983	RESIDENT	LPCD4681	0	This document is a travesty. The drop in standards appears to be a result of the privatisation of council services.... ..I apologise for the brevity of my objections but I found your provisions for consulting on the document well hidden and designed not to encourage responses.	1 Introduction
806986	RESIDENT	LPCD4690	0	I wish to object to the draft North Tyneside's LDF, and the proposals contained within it. The focus of my objections are as follows :- ~the evidential base for the proposals is weak .	1 Introduction
807368	RESIDENT	LPCD5015	0	The plan must also be revised to take account of the fact that the surrounding local authorities are also seeking in their Local Plans to have large amounts of new housing, retail and office development built. All of these plans are based on similar dubious extrapolations of past trends to predict future need, with completely inadequate attention to the question of sustainability.	1 Introduction
808354	RESIDENT	LPCD5690	0	It won't make a blind bit of difference what anybody thinks you will just go ahead anyway. Its an abomination concreting over beautiful countryside killing wildlife and destroying their habitat. It means more people more traffic, pollution flooding more queues for everything, doctors dentists, schools, shops ect. Why don't you bulldoze all those useless empty cobalt business park which have been curiously standing empty for years and build your houses on that land that's already been destroyed. As for protecting and enhancing green spaces and wildlife, thats a joke there won't be any left, its tragic. This will all be a huge mistake you can't just keep cramming more people in without dreadful consequences the future is bleak.	1 Introduction
808372	RESIDENT	LPCD5719	0	This consultation draft has been missed by many (was that the plan) as slipped into other info. Not enough public events. Sat drop in 9th Nov at Library but didn't get draft till after that date. So only one in W Bay Nov 21st 3pm-7pm not good, right on the time to pick children up from school. So no opportunity to speak to someone, then over Christmas, no contact, and questionnaire for such a fast amount of people has been missed through no fault of their own, this has not been done fairly, not at all!!	1 Introduction
808506	RESIDENT	LPCD5751	0	I can't make head or tail of this map but from what the papers say and people you have made your minds up. I would like to see it all down in black and white and clear. Don't forget its people that matter.	1 Introduction
808534	RESIDENT	LPCD5754	0	Sorry couldn't reply sooner, but the plan is a waste of time as it does not indicate the existing use of the areas marked in pink!	1 Introduction
809765	RESIDENT	LPCD6594	0	I note in the opening of the Summary North Tyneside's desire to ...plan to protect the unique character and attractiveness of our borough as well as provide the land for jobs and homes to meet our needs.... In my opinion the substantial areas proposed for employment, but mainly housing,	1 Introduction

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				will destroy some of the uniqueness and attractiveness North Tyneside says it wants to protect, particularly in the area north and east of Gosforth Park and adjoining the Rising Sun Country Park.	
451166	0	LPCD258	0	I am aware that central government wants local authorities to make provision for many communities. Please ensure that any such provision is not near to existing or future housing, as regrettably such people have a bad reputation for crime, disorder and low standards of living.	1 Introduction
793117	0	LPCD688	0	The Local Plan should look to ensure the Borough is not over developed, even if that means the number of houses to be built is less than the predicted 'need'. There should be no significant housing development east of the A19 and existing green spaces preserved.	1 Introduction
799147	0	LPCD2215	0	I wish to object in the strongest terms to draft proposals for housing development around Murton Village.	1 Introduction
799775	0	LPCD2258	0	My main worry and concern is not the fact that you intend to build on areas marked 22, 23, 24, 25, & 26. It is simply that I do not believe enough detail or consideration has been placed on the access routes to these building sites, the level of trucks and lorries which will be required to have access to this land will be enormous! And yet you have nothing detailed about how you plan to allow these trucks access to the site. (I have been informed that you plan to have the Trucks 'line up' along the road which is at the entrance to Forest Gate until a notified time in the morning. I find this truly unacceptable as they will be 'queuing' outside my back garden, creating not only noise pollution, but also a severe and very real danger to the local community. The stretch of road proposed for this action is already a hazardous area in all kinds of weather as it is not only traffic lighted which can be a small congestion in its self, but it also has speed humps and a very tight bend at the bottom. I believe you will be putting lives at risk if you carry out this proposed access. Trucks are very large and cumbersome and I myself would find it very difficult to drive down that road to get out of my own estate to get to work in the morning as I fear I will not be able to either see what is coming on the opposite side of the road or if any pedestrians are wanting to cross the road. The trucks will either have to take up a very large proportion of the road or park half on and half off the kerb, which I believe is not only dangerous but also unlawful. I would like to know what your response is to my complaint and how you plan to either adjust your access routes or what other measures you have to propose.	1 Introduction
800665	0	LPCD2363	0	I think we need to be incredibly careful that we do not completely over-develop the area, especially east of the A19 and along the coast. Continued development at the current rate will undermine the very reason that many people want to live here. Green space around West Monkseaton and Earsdon is already shrinking dramatically and I think that further large-scale development will turn it into a large housing estate altering the current character. I understand the council's desire to increase the tax base but over-building will permanently change the nature of the area and I believe further large scale development is unsustainable.	1 Introduction
797110	0	LPCD2720	0	I found this an interesting document with some good points. However I found it generally flawed when considered from a truly Green perspective. What follows are my general suggestions to improve the	1 Introduction

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>Plan by giving it a truly Greenist viewpoint and so make it a guide to creating a truly sustainable future for the communities that make up North Tyneside. Sustainable Economic Growth is, from a true Green point of view, an oxymoron. As such any plan that is based upon it is doomed to failure. Sustainability is the essential concept here which means achieving a holistic balance within the community of economic activity. Proposal 5.1: Economic Growth Strategy makes several suggestions as to how you see such growth could be achieved. However, they are so general that it would be very hard to argue against any of them. What we would like to see is overall in the plan a commitment to true Green economics as a basis of sustainable progress in all sections of our communities. We are very concerned about proposal 2.1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development. We believe that if there are no "up to date" or "no policies" then the permission should be REFUSED until the council has either updated old polices or agreed a new policy that cover the matters. Nothing should ever be "nodded through" the system because the council has failed to create or update policy. I am in favour of the proposals 4.6 Employment and Skills. However, I would like to see a greater emphasis on truely Green skills and employment rather than the increasingly unsustainable options creating "boom and bust factory fodder." We would also like to see a greater emphasis on rural skills and employment within the borough. I realise that there needs to be a certain level of housing across the borough and I was very pleased to see proposal 6.11 Local Facilities. I would hope that "local community facilities" could be included as places for both young and old to meet in safety are as important as "convenience stores" and the like. I would also like to see this applied to both new build and existing estates. In relation to Green Belt and safeguarded land as describe in proposals 3.2 to 3.5 and others I feel that this is some of the most valuable land in the borough and any safeguards upon it should be as permanent as is possible protecting it for the community in perpetuity, even possibly even giving it full Green Belt status. Neighbourhood planning as described in proposal 4.1 Supporting Neighbourhood Planning is an excellent idea, but these neighbourhoods will need to be funded and provided with suitable facilities to produce these plans. To these ends i would like to see a commitment to the establishment of "Town or Parish Councils" across the borough. The north bank of the Tyne, along with the North Tyneside coast are important cultural and biological resources that should be freely available to the people of the borough and beyond. As such there should be free accessibility to the North Bank for as much of its length as possible so that it would be possible to walk or cycle from the borough's south west corner to its north east corner. I believe that by adopting these along with the other minor changes I propose, North Tyneside Borough Council will produce a radical plan that will produce a truly sustainable community that will prosper long into the twenty first century and beyond. Dec.2013</p>	
803493	0	LPCD2804	0	<p>Section 1.11 - 1.17. It is encouraging that the Plan recognises that the role and economics of North Tyneside are closely inter-related with those of Newcastle City and South East Northumberland for employment, leisure, shopping and housing needs. This inter-relation is an important factor to consider when reviewing the Borough's sustainability requirements. The Plan acknowledges that the</p>	1 Introduction

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>close physical and community links with these neighbouring areas play a key role in the Borough's housing market and travel to work arrangements. However the Plan fails to mention in this introduction that North Tyneside provides an equally important role for the wider region by providing key leisure and amenity facilities with particular value arising from its natural coastline, estuary, open spaces, heritage sites and seascape vistas. To ensure this unique contribution to the well-being of the region is maintained, the Plan should therefore also recognise that North Tyneside has a responsibility to ensure that the Borough's current characteristics and attributes of the natural coastline, open spaces, heritage sites, conservation areas and riverside estuarial environments are protected and enhanced. Section 1.31. Is June 2014 the correct date? Section 1.33. The potential for required housing growth in North Tyneside will also depend closely on the housing availability / requirements within Newcastle City and South East Northumberland. To minimise the possibility of unnecessary infrastructure expenditure and over capacity provision, it is therefore essential that North Tyneside does not embark on too many large scale greenfield site housing developments that will duplicate the provisions being made in these adjoining areas such as at Newcastle Great Park, Cramlington and Blyth. Planned housing developments in North Tyneside should therefore preferably be incremental, in-fill, small scale and able to respond to changes in housing demand.</p>	
804055	0	LPCD2629	0	<p>I wish to register my objection to this draft plan. Insufficient consideration has been given to the redevelopment of existing brown field sites within North Tyneside and greenfield sites offer the only experience our emerging youth will have of the vanishing countryside which we as adults remember. Existing road structures cannot cope with daily commuter traffic and are not maintained. New roads that would have to be created would remove resource from the current difficult transport maintenance sector.</p>	1 Introduction
804219	0	LPCD2639	0	<p>I welcome this consultation but would also urge the council to consider very carefully to make certain that any new development does not alienate existing communities and infrastructure. One of the key elements of consideration if the protection and enhancement of our Public Rights of Way and Cycle Network. It is essential that we fully exploit and tie directly into the network to minimise the reliance on car travel for short journeys. Given the recent and growing tragic events on pedestrian and cyclists deaths across the country, we must use this opportunity to build in Dutch/Danish style infrastructure and fully pedestrianize our town centres (save buses and accessibility parking). We must be seen to set the standard and insist that developers buy into this vision. Thanks to central government investment and set LTP allocations, Newcastle Council have £12m to invest in altering the layout of access roads to and from the City Centre along 7 segregated, safe and direct cycle routes over the next 4 years. Four of these routes will stop at the border of North Tyneside and we must link into these with the same level of commitment. To fund this we can insist that developers contribute to off site improvements to mitigate the increase in traffic their sites will produce. If we demonstrate real commitment and vision and investment in highway safety we can make a huge impact on the short motor journeys we are all</p>	1 Introduction

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				guilty of. Sure, this will upset many motorists but given time and commitment they too will come to realise the benefits this brings to all parts of our community and places North Tyneside back amongst the can do Councils.	
804807	0	LPCD2760	0	I strongly object to the ill-considered expectations being raised by the first draft that extensive remaining tracts of Greenfield land in the Borough are being offered up as potential housing sites over the next 15 years. In my opinion, this flies in the face of sustainable development, including for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>â€¢ The irreversible loss of productive or potentially productive farmland; much of which is recorded as being of good quality,</li> <li>â€¢ The associated loss of the wide range of functions associated with the soil resources on this land,</li> <li>â€¢ The infilling of areas of green infrastructure, that help define existing communities, and offer great potential for public recreation and health,</li> <li>â€¢ A lazy approach to predict and provide housing allocations that takes little account of recent initiatives favouring priority being given to Brownfield and derelict land reclamation in favour of Greenfield sites,</li> <li>â€¢ Offering up potential Greenfield sites which will always be favoured as the easier and cheaper options by developers (who apparently already hold options on some of the farmland concerned),</li> <li>â€¢ A less than impressive record of the Council previously allocating Greenfield sites on the strength of economic imperatives, only for these to emerge as â€œwhite elephantsâ€ (think of the Siemens development and the acres of empty office space on the Cobalt site. In my opinion, a priority of the Plan should be to seek to promote the redevelopment of all Brownfield, derelict and declining urban areas (including for example empty industrial, office and retail accommodation with little prospect of any demand for these uses), prior to acquiescing in the loss of the valuable but diminishing areas of countryside in the Borough. Clearly not the approach favoured by developers and their lobbyist, but the best option for the amenity and quality of life in the Borough.</li> </ul>	1 Introduction
592249	0	LPCD3801	0	Table sites 17,18 It is a crime to even consider concreting over the last significant piece of greenfield in the Ward - ALL other similar sized greenfield areas have now been built on over the last 20 years. From a wellbeing aspect the fields on both side facilitate outdoor activities including trekking, jogging, cycling, dog walking as well as providing impressive panoramic views and a scenic corridor to visitors approaching the borough of Wallsend from the North. On a more practical and economic level the traffic congestion along the Station Road corridor is already approaching chronic levels having increased ten fold in as many years. And a recent planning application even included small retail units!! SHEER MADNESS. Also nearby schools are increasingly congested - St Bernadettes in particular has had to sacrifice vital playing areas to extend buildings just to cope with current levels that have been more or less forced onto them. And on top of all that there is the aspect of flooding - more concrete laid uphill will simply exasperate the types of problems that devastated the residents of downhill Chicken Road very recently.	1 Introduction
804850	0	LPCD2781	0	The area around West Monkseaton/Murton must not be considered for development. Earsdon Road, Seatonville Road, Hillheads Road, Shields Road Rake Lane are already overburdened by traffic and are	1 Introduction

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				at bursting point. Speeding and congestion already go unregulated causing misery for existing residents. The area between West Monkseaton and Murton must be returned to greenbelt as it once was to provide much needed open space for quality of life and farmland to produce food .North Tyneside cannot be turned into a "concrete jungle". Any developments must be place either on the A19 corridor or the A189 spine road, this would provide access directly to main "Trunk Roads" with the simple construction of slip roads. This access would ensure that local roads such as the above would not be gridlocked as they currently are.	
804902	0	LPCD2907	0	There is a massive danger than this plan could lead to the over development of areas within North Tyneside. Traffic congestion is already a massive problem and to attempt to build anywhere, especially East of the A19, will without doubt increase the number of vehicles on the road and make the situation worse. I understand that this is a government lead initiative, however, those leading these policies don't live here and it's time to say enough is enough. Whenever it rains these days, many residents of the borough collectively hold their breath as flooding becomes more and more of an issue. It is raining more and that is not going to go away, but historically by building on so many areas of green field land the situation has been made all the more worse. Please build upon brown field land before looking at green field land, otherwise there will be no where for our future generations to enjoy.	1 Introduction
804902	0	LPCD2917	0	Before deciding upon the the future for the area and specifically when looking at the area around Murton Village please take into account planning applications (13/01056/FUL 269 comments, mainly objections) and (12/01644/FUL 63 comments, mainly objections) .This area is used and enjoyed by many and to destroy this for the sake of finances would be disgraceful.	1 Introduction
804992	0	LPCD2962	0	Over development of the West Monkseaton and surrounding area will cause extreme congestion as the road infra structure cannot take the increase in traffic. Currently there are traffic hold ups from 4.30pm until 6pm every working evening, the Coast Road, Rake Lane and A186 are all severely congested by the volume of existing traffic trying to get home - this is a basic function of life. If the council persists with the proposed over development this will surely detract from attraction of the area, lower house prices etc.	1 Introduction
805211	0	LPCD3260	0	On point 1.38; What assessment, if any, has been undertaken on the potential impacts of the Local Plan on wildlife sites which are not "European designated" sites? Further work needs to be undertaken to assess impacts on all sites which have a wildlife value, whether they are designated or not. For example, the Local Plan includes potential development on swathes of agricultural land across North Tyneside, which are not designated as wildlife sites. However, these areas are just as important to local wildlife and migratory birds entering the country from the East, as those sites which are afforded protection along the coast.	1 Introduction
805358	0	LPCD3584	0	I trust that you are listing dozens of sites for housing and other development knowing that many will not be developed. Because if you seriously think and intend that most will be developed, you will have truly created a concrete jungle of 'little boxes, little boxes' as the old song goes. Recent housing	1 Introduction



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				development in the Borough generally lack quality and interest. You, the Council, should lead the developers not let them run rings round you. Demand higher and more green standards. If they will not meet these, then let them take their sad little boxes somewhere else. Make the Borough an interesting place to live and to visit , not the dull collection of dreary housing estates that it is fast becoming. Have you the guts to do this?	
805429	0	LPCD3665	0	Firstly I would like to thank the council for putting this document together and it is a good read with some laudable goals. It is also easy to follow and I hope by commenting on it, the council will add to their plans by considering the views of those who live in the area.	1 Introduction
805471	0	LPCD3680	0	I am concerned about the large amount of greenfield development planned for areas 21-28 and 35-41 Whereas it is clear additional housing stock is needed it alarms me that such large swathes of land are being considered. It would seem more prudent to look at re zoning current industrial usage areas that are now derelict/vacant and an eyesore and site for vandalism. One of the attractive points of the Borough is the green space and yet you seek to destroy large areas with your plans. In addition the road and transport infrastructures in these areas is already pressured and barely copes. Concentrated development in so few sites offers poor choice and gross risk or devaluing existing builds. In addition building around the Wagon Ways appears to defeat the object of encouraging attractive travel ways across the Borough. It would be more innovative to set up smaller developments offering wider choice and more equal opportunities for housing throughout the Borough	1 Introduction
805506	0	LPCD3760	0	I am greatly concerned that by allowing the potential development on large areas of green space that North Tyneside will become one large urban area. I personally believe that a lot of the extreme weather changes that we are experiencing are as a result of the continued plunder on our natural spaces, irreversibly altering our climate and in effect creating the conditions for these extremes to occur. If every "local" government doesn't play their part in reducing this advance on our natural spaces then Britain and the wider world will become sterile, and areas of natural space will become so rare that our natural plants, animals and birds will become more threatened than they already are. Birds in particular are being dramatically affected by the loss of natural habitat with bird numbers declining by unprecedented numbers in this country and in parts of Europe. Do you as Councillors want to add to this by further eroding our natural spaces. What about all the derelict land and the opportunities about the redevelopment of these spaces? Do you want to create a sterile legacy for our children or if we are lucky the children of our children? I am strongly against these local plans and the potential to create building / development space which would in effect create a solid belt of buildings around Murton village.	1 Introduction
805510	0	LPCD3770	0	I am extremely unhappy with what is in my opinion an excessive and imbalanced plan to consider the area from West Monkseaton/ Murton Village to Shiremoor for housing/ any other development on the greenfield sites over the next 15 years. I am especially dismayed that the current elected Mayor and Council (political party noted by my family, neighbours and myself for future elections) have seemingly	1 Introduction

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>rapidly produced this ill-balanced plan despite such an emphasis these days on green/ environmental issues. It is disappointing to see that this generation is the generation planning to irreversibly utilise/ lose these Greenfield sites which our predecessors protected to date. In object for the following reasons: - The irreversible loss of valuable and scarce Greenfield sites/ farmland, - The loss of areas of green infrastructure, that help beautify existing communities, and provide excellent opportunities for public recreation and health, - Increasing the likelihood of adverse events such as flooding (recently devastating for local families/ children) and traffic jams (already a worsening issue ruining quality of life and time spent with families/ friends as well as likelihood of accidents). Indeed I am dismayed at the lack of adequate/ meaningful response to West Monkseaton flooding compared to the rapid prioritisation of work on Greenfield development near West Monkseaton. - Brownfield sites should be considered first in addition to favouring derelict land reclamation. - a less than successful record of the Council previously allocating Greenfield sites due to economic considerations, e.g., the acres of empty office space on the Cobalt site. In my view, and many people I know agree, the Plan should promote the redevelopment of all Brownfield, derelict and declining urban areas (including for example empty industrial and office areas) rather than the valuable areas of Greenfields in the West Monkseaton, Murton, Shiremoor and other areas. Finally, I would like to say shame on you, Council, to propose this. I do not recall this being mentioned upfront when your representatives knocked on my door for a vote recently claiming to improve the quality of life of local residents. Myself and many others will not forget this in future elections both local and national. I ask you to kindly reconsider for the sake of Borough residents quality of life and not financial considerations.</p>	
805543	0	LPCD3845	0	<p>1. Any or all new housing must be restricted to existing brown field sites. The current plan follows the previous plan with the clear ethic: "Let's cover North Tyneside with bricks"2. There is no independent evidence presented which calls for any increase in housing requirement. In fact the Council should be actively engaged in reducing the unsustainable increases in population. 3. The vague wildlife corridors indicated on Map 1 do not exist. In fact the housing sites proposed will completely smother the most excellent Rising Sun Country Park. 4. The loss of green field sites to housing in the last two decades has exacerbated the flooding potential for North Tyneside. At Holystone, for instance, concentrated housing was placed where fields were constantly waterlogged and as such the ground water levels are very high and increasing. This has a knock-on effect for rain water drains which cannot take the additional output from green field site development without a vast infrastructure drain building programme. Many other areas in North Tyneside suffer from high ground water levels. Building on green field sites increases the problem.</p>	1 Introduction
466426	0	LPCD3852	0	<p>Areas 17 &amp; 18 should not be developed to prevent the Rising Sun Country Park being surrounded by buildings. Areas 23-26 and 35-41 should not be fully developed, large green corridors should be kept to prevent Killingworth joining with Holystone and Shiremoor joining with Monkseaton. Areas 4,8,9,10,11 and 109 should not be developed. Gosforth Park and Weetslade C P need Green/Agricultural areas</p>	1 Introduction

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>around them to provide access and feeding for wildlife. Gosforth Park Nature Reserve would not survive in its present, healthy, state if it is surrounded by development. This would also keep West Moor separate from Longbenton. Preventing areas merging into one another helps maintain a sense of Community in what at one time were separate villages. It is important not to let North Tyneside become one urban sprawl. Developing areas 8-11 would also increase the risk of flooding at South Gosforth and along the Ouseburn. Part of Area 11 is the last remaining area of flood plain that is now Greenhoff housing estate. Areas 5,6 and 7 should be redeveloped as either housing or modern units for small businesses. The old Gas Research building should be kept as it is one of the iconic buildings of North Tyneside. The Great Lime Rd, Sandy Lane, A189 and the A188 are all heavily congested at peak times and even with the alterations on the A189 any further development around this area will only make things much worse. I'm sure Blyth Valley will also be increasing its Development Areas and this will have a knock on effect on the amount of traffic using these roads to access Newcastle/ N. Tyneside. There are a large number of empty office blocks/factory units standing empty, several for long periods, in the existing Business Parks at Quorum, Balliol and Cobalt. Surely these should be utilised before new areas are developed.</p>	
466968	0	LPCD4074	0	<p>This is the most appallingly complex form of commenting that I have ever come across. Why on earth could we not submit all our comments in one go, on the whole document, without having to go through the rigmarole of listing gender and sexuality for each comment we want to make! Not user friendly nor an efficient use of time. Was your intention to deter people from commenting???</p>	1 Introduction
805263	0	LPCD4200	0	<p>I object strongly to the proposals council should concentrate on keeping green spaces and improving public transport system, improving roads and existing estates, more houses will make more transport to already congested roads, how would existing schools cope? Flooding already major issue in this area</p>	1 Introduction
805479	0	LPCD3941	0	<p>This Draft Local Plan seems to ignore the needs of local people in favour of the clamouring of National Government for more development and housing. The current apathy and lack of confidence in the whole political system will be reinforced if the council fails to support local residents views and responses to the local plan. In this respect alone I urge the council to properly look after the wishes of the community they are here to represent. How will this plan recognise real need, the aging population, the out of work, the alienated and excluded as well as attempt to secure the recovery and rebuilding of failing towns, Whitley Bay, North Shields etc? And ask yourself who you represent, and when people stop voting because they feel there is no point because they aren't listened to, who will be to blame.</p>	1 Introduction
805544	0	LPCD3833	0	<p>I was shocked to see how many of the green spaces in North Tyneside are earmarked as potential development sites. Actually even the smallest space has potential for 15 houses (the small field on Seatonville Estate for example). I can't imagine how many houses could fit on the area of land between Rake Lane and Earsdon. Why not just concrete over the whole of North Tyneside and have done with it? I presume most of the occupants of this new housing will work and shop out of the area. Lets face it</p>	1 Introduction

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>Whitley Bay is like a ghost town, all those empty shops, pubs, offices etc. Perhaps the potential buyers of the vast numbers of new houses(buy to rent perhaps?) should be told about the long traffic jams in and out of the area at peak times. Will the increase in the amount of Council Tax received by North Tyneside Council provide a whole new road system etc? Why not spend money improving the area for existing residents, (Spanish City, Whitley Bay seafront, Tynemouth outdoor pool for example) and develop existing empty buildings, offices and brownfield sites for housing?</p>	
805554	0	LPCD3889	0	<p>I live in the Northumberland Ward and wish to register the strongest possible objection to the continued identification of areas 17 and 18 for potential future development. A recent proposal from persimmon house builders was sensibly rejected but I fear that the continued inclusion of these areas on the plan is a clear indication that the council will finally cave in and develop them. The plan contains no credible evidence that potential flooding around station road/Hadrian lodge will be addressed for the residents of Hadrian Lodge and Hadrian Lodge West. There is also no indication in the infrastructure plan of how further serious traffic congestion would be avoided if over 1,100 new homes are built at the north end of station road along with the smaller developments off mullen road. Even more of a concern if that the council has failed to identify sites 17 and 18 as green belt area as they provide the only meaningful, continuous belt of green space between the river tyne and forest hall/killingwirth areas. If the two sites are developed on then Wallsend will lose its identity. Wildlife around the Rising Sun County Park will be impacted and the quality of life for people living in and around Hardian Lodge and Hadrian Lodge West and other surrounding areas will be diminished. That said, I think the proposals to develop along Mullen Road on the former Parkside School and nurseries should be supported and the vacant dorset house site to contribute towards the need for increased housing stock. However, I feel the plan seriously over estimates the population growth and household increase in the borough through to 2030 and the evidence is weak to suggest a near 30,000 population increase in 19 years when the increase between 1991 and 2011 was just 7,000. I also feel that the council must address the vacant housing stock in the borough. On the wider plan, I feel the proposal to develop the brownfield sites are sensible, particularly in Wallsend Ward which will aesthetically improve the town and be good for local business and the new town centre. I also feel that the proposals to develop areas 19 and 20 in the Killingworth Ward are sensible as well as area 16 in the Wallsend Ward. I share the concerns of the residents around the Shiremoor, Earsdon, West Monkseaton areas about the over development around their living spaces. Brownfield development must remain the priority for the council and preserve as much of our remaining green space as possible and the identity of the towns within the borough. Some of the pan looks positive but I reiterate my strongest possible objection to sites 17 and 18 being developed in the Northumberland Ward.</p>	1 Introduction
805597	0	LPCD3965	0	<p>I understand that this document has identified all sites that COULD be developed however at what point does someone in authority step in and realise that if we are not careful we will become concert</p>	1 Introduction

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				city which is sole less and open green spaces are in the very distant past. Any development around West Moor / Killingworth must be avoided, there has already been substantial development in the area and the infrastructure (in places such as West Moor, Forrest Hall, Great Lime road etc) simply cant take more traffic and congestion. The loss of wildlife and open spaces has a huge effect on peoples mental heath and I feel strongly as an active member of the community that our community identity will be lost with even further development. What about using brown field sites where offices and factories have been closed? What about empty houses both council and private that are not rented out? All of these factors need to be considered before using green field sites or further developing sites such as 9 and 10. Remove these along with sites 8 and 11 for the benefit of all in the area.	
805626	0	LPCD3983	0	If everywhere gets developed there will be no green areas, no wildlife corridor, nature will be something you visit in museums as part of our heritage. By all means redevelop areas that were previously built on but remember that the current infrastructure will not support too much more traffic. I am pleased that there are fields at the end of the street for children to enjoy; this plan will resign future generations to living in dormitories in concrete jungles.	1 Introduction
589608	0	LPCD6014	0	I am impressed by the level of erudition expressed in residentsâ€™ online views. I have no background in planning so this is an old fashioned letter in response to the elaborate and (probably) expensive consultation. North Tyneside would be a very claustrophobic place to live if we did not have the coast. The existing green spaces are vital. I walk and cycle a lot and enjoy bird-watching. People deserve decent facilities and schools with playing areas. The current Government is starving local authorities of money and then berating them when they do not have the resources to help flood victims, boost school results etc. No wonder people become disillusioned and voter turn out is so low. The consultation veers from great sophistication of complexity of information available on-line, word by word analysis, information to every home etc. to the bluntly misleading e.g. implication that the Ice Rink will be razed and 210 houses built.	1 Introduction
807924	RESIDENT	LPCD272	0	The written plan is as usual rather long-winded and boring to read, but having persevered I cannot find any undue criticism of the plan, thus I support it in its entirety.	1 The Local Plan
794220	RESIDENT	LPCD1324	0	I think this is a great idea asking our opinions, I feel happy that I am being listened to as this is our community.	1 The Local Plan
794594	RESIDENT	LPCD1533	0	Over the past 20 or so years North Tyneside has sold most of its buildings and land, what has happened to all the money these sales made. Council offices seem to be sited in rented premises.	1 The Local Plan
795649	RESIDENT	LPCD1728	0	Your map should be grid referenced to give people more options	1 The Local Plan
798239	RESIDENT	LPCD2055	0	I have studied the North Tyneside potential development site proposals and would like to make the following comments. Central and western area's seem to be excessively mentioned, nothing is proposed to the north and very little to the east and south, a rather unfair bias. Westmoor, Killingworth and Longbenton will have very few green areas left if all proposals are carried. I	1 The Local Plan

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>particularly object to areas 8 and 11, the Westmoor/ spine road round about already has traffic problems so to build on two more sites by this round-a-bout will only lead to increased traffic build up causing safety concerns for people/children using the adjacent community centre. I am not a NIMBY and realise new housing is needed. I feel the council has done very well in developing brown field sites 5,6 and 7. One point I have noticed is that as increasingly more local land is concreted over the problem with flooding is becoming more apparant, especially at the afore mentioned round-a-bout, the low point of all local roads. I feel Westmoor is in danger of losing its identity, council publications and information booklets regarding the borough often fail to recognise we exist.</p>	
798282	RESIDENT	LPCD2059	0	<p>There should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development - land use must not change the balance of open/built environment. There are many spaces within this area which are not used to full potential. Preference should be for affordable housing close to local retail and public transport. Building on open space makes the region unattractive to inward investment where the priority must be in manufacturing. No large retail or service sector. All organisations providing services to the council must be based in the local area for all functions- not remote management. The web portal for this consultation is not fit for purpose.</p>	1 The Local Plan
467684	RESIDENT	LPCD3583	0	<p>Your consultation website is difficult to access and not fit for purpose - a cynical person would this was a deliberate move on your part. Please see the enclosed slip that I have filled in, in answer to your biased questions. The form is misleading and answers can be manipulated to meet the council's needs. The form presupposes there is a need for housing/development so by responding logically to the questions (leading questions) the unwary actually go along with your policies and merely have a "say" in the destructions of green fields which, I am sure, no sane person would agree to. I also repeat " your consultation website is not fit for purpose. I spent 40 minutes navigating it, trying to find a simple comments box I could write in. The website is confusing, badly signposted and difficult to use " is this deliberate to put people off? Your timing is clever too " are you hoping people won't take time at busy Christmas time to reply?</p>	1 The Local Plan
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3266	0	<p>If you want to keep North Tyneside attractive to investors and residents you must keep the green and open spaces we have. If you are worried we don't have enough houses please try use the spaces where derelict buildings now stand. Can empty shop, office and commercial buildings be converted to residential?</p>	1 The Local Plan
588278	RESIDENT	LPCD2759	0	<p>It would be helpful if the Site Assessments had identified whether there was a current or lapsed Planning Consent for each site, indicating exactly what the consent would provide. This would then relate to the wider information concerning housing numbers. On a specific point, under section DM/7.8, self build housing, the requirement for provision to be made only on sites exceeding 200 units is not supported by any analysis or indication regarding the number of self-build units this could generate. Provision of this data with a preference for applying the criteria to smaller sites, should be actioned.</p>	1 The Local Plan

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
798606	RESIDENT	LPCD2110	0	Reduce council tax. Planning rules should allow change of use for commercial buildings e.g shop- food. Consider building up instead of out to preserve land and green belt. Release self-build land but for space saving town houses rather than mansions. Tax incentives for business start ups and reduce regulation to ease start-ups. In a nutshell- less regulation, less tax.	1 The Local Plan
798761	RESIDENT	LPCD3455	0	Thank you for reading my reply to your Consultation Draft. I’ve tried to persuade other people to take an interest – unfortunately, most tell me that even local politicians take little notice of local opinion once they have been elected - + so feel disheartened. I do hope you only build on Greenfield/agricultural land as a last resort – ie once all –brownfield– land has been used up. Please use –brownfield– areas for development – i.e. practice, please, what politicians preach – restore electors’ trust.	1 The Local Plan
803506	RESIDENT	LPCD2484	0	Concerned with the consultation draft. I do not have the details/ information to decide what should not be developed, as the infrastructure and number of sites proposed is so large! Also feel that projected financial estimates could be provided which would help sorting out the wheat from the chaff! Particularly with regard to the potential developmnt sites (shown in pink on the plan) "Keir" can't build them all so we need competitive tendering!	1 The Local Plan
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4925	0	The most important policies in the assessment of planning applications are those that form 'material considerations' covered by the Development Management policies. Unfortunately none of the draft policies will have any significant weight until they are agreed by central government (2015 at the earliest) - whilst the equivalent policies in the 2002 UDP have reducing credibility as they are now influenced by the NPPF.	1 The Local Plan
639822	RESIDENT	LPCD5375	0	No objections to the latest draft.	1 The Local Plan
806262	RESIDENT	LPCD4378	0	With regard to the Consultation Draft November 2013. I have now spent nearly a day trying to make comment on your website consultation re these plans. I am not totally computer illiterate, but was unable to make any headway what so ever. Your consultation is most inappropriate as it hit the holiday period ad people were engaged in how they were to meet the coming celebrations. However I would wish these comments to be added to the consultation as I am unable to do so any other way.	1 The Local Plan
807925	RESIDENT	LPCD3963	0	Now listen, you who say "today, tomorrow or in 10 years we will do this or that." Why you do not even know what your own life tomorrow will be. What is life? You are no more than a mist that appears for a little while and then disappears. Only if it is the Lord's will, will you live to do this or that (James, 4:13).	1 The Local Plan
805302	0	LPCD3400	0	It is vital that the area around Hillheads that includes the Whitley Bay FC ground and the ice rink among others should remain as it is currently. The area is central to sporting activity in Whitley with local football, ice hockey, cricket and rugby clubs all based there. In particular the football club and ice hockey club have in recent years provided the town with plenty of good publicity by winning a number of national titles; including Whitley Bay FC being the only club to have won three consecutive finals at the new Wembley - along with a host of other records set. By taking away the sporting facilities you	1 The Local Plan

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				would be depriving Whitley Bay of one of the few opportunities it has to be seen in the national spotlight.	
805307	0	LPCD3409	0	I am totally opposed to the use of a community amenity like the ice rink to be used for housing. this is all about private profit and not social necessities. when health and well being is so vital for adults and especially children and as well as the social side of skating , it is a total error to consider throwing away this wonderfull amenity, which will not be replaced . I hope our representatives will respond to our protests, rather than to building speculators, who are being encouraged by government.	1 The Local Plan
636827	0	LPCD5371	0	No objections to the latest draft.	1 The Local Plan
805305	0	LPCD4130	0	I would like to register my thoughts on the proposed development sites as per the plan we received through the door a few months ago. I was disappointed not to find the same form available to complete on line on the council web site that was on the back of the plan. However, the form asked for comments on which areas I “preferred” to be developed and not areas that I wanted to see protected. This I felt to be un fair and that residents in north Tyneside were being encouraged to vote for areas that they had no connection to, in order to protect areas close to their hearts.	1 The Local Plan
805563	0	LPCD6578	0		0 1 The Local Plan
805704	0	LPCD4349	0	Preamble - Sustainable Development and Democracy I appreciate the challenge to us all to help draft a Local Plan in a way that ultimately satisfies the requirements of the National Planning Framework while asserting the aspirations of local people. Achieving Sustainable Development really leaves no one out for we are all consumers. Engaging everyone therefore requires that the draft is written in way that is understandable and accessible so that all may contribute to it. That task has largely been achieved and it is in that spirit of democracy and citizenship that the following is written. It is hoped that this contributes to what could and should be an ongoing conversation between people who care about our future. The National Planning Policy Framework. In the introduction to the NPPF the Planning Minister proposes that development means growth and has a vision of the future in which we will have to compete in the global economy for the resources that present forms of growth will inevitably make scarce. We live in a finite planet. Another view might be that the human species has owed its existence to the realisation that as social animals we succeed best when we are self responsible, co-operate with each other, share fairly what we have and sustain the natural world so that our children futures are assured. Sustainable development reminds us that we must learn to live well, to live creatively but within the natural means of the planet. The Planning Minister might have mentioned that what prompted the Brundtland Commission to universalise the concept of sustainable development was forms of growth that have led to “ -Over consumption, air pollution, oil and mineral extraction and depletion, deforestation, desertification, starvation, poverty, soil depletion, species and habitat loss, waste, water scarcity, food shortages, marine degradation, phosphate depletion, gross inequality and so on. It has become increasingly evident as well that some of these factors together with greenhouse gas emissions have led to changes in the climate. The causes of this	1 The Local Plan



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>were identified as mainly western forms of consumption and economic development. It was noted that these were being exported. North Tyneside is not immune from the consequences of them, the inequalities grow and more people are struggling to afford life’s essentials. We see them translated into cost and price but these measures distance us from the reasons why and a coherent response. With those inconvenient truths identified, Brundtland urged that, in future when development is being contemplated, it should be assessed with economic, environmental and social criteria which are taken together. The report which appeared in 1992 also proposed that action for development should be taken locally but referenced to the global. The Guiding Principal of the NPPF is Sustainable Development. From the outset I would expect the Local Plan to recognise this and address its implications throughout the document. It would be helpful then for the Local Plan to provide a full definition of Sustainable Development. The Local Plan. Thinking global, but acting local has increasingly sounded like good advice especially over the last few years. The price of many of the essentials for living have continued to increase and are ever more subject to the global market place. Amongst these essentials are food, air, shelter, water, materials and energy. Land is a fundamental and stands in relation to all of these yet, although we all consume them, can we any longer be content to leave availability and accessibility to the global market place or indeed a national market place? The competition the Minister anticipates may not be only external to this Society. The people who are the people left behind are those who increasingly cannot afford the essentials. As things are, we are not sustainable as a country or a local borough. That much was clear during the second world war and our population has increased considerably since then. We no longer have an empire and the rest of the world has begun to recognise the true value of their natural resources. We are massively in debt to heaven knows who. We are unable to provide the population with sufficient food so much of it is imported. We also need to import our oil and gas, and many other materials. However we can consider how to reduce our dependency, optimise the use of what we have, re establish a local economy and public control over those life essentials such as land, food, water, energy and accessibility. Move to a zero carbon economy. The proposition is to retain existing agricultural land, explore utilising other land for growing food and other uses which promote biodiversity and develop an appreciation of the natural world. This could mean experimenting with different forms of ownership and distribution say “community supported agriculture, permaculture, providing locally grown and organic supplies of fresh food to public facilities such as “schools, hospitals, day centres etc. Monkseaton High School and Rake Lane Hospital would seem one obvious location say and might at the same time provide an educational resource for the school as well. The question that gives rise to is what local actions can address these realities and uncertainties? - what sort of people, what sort of community will have the resilience, the strengths and the resourcefulness? “are these identified in the Vision and Objectives? This suggests other strategic priorities in addition to those identified all of which are then coordinated to support the development of a sustainable community. Bearing this in</p>	

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				mind it would be helpful to have a definition of a sustainable community “ an ideal for the 21st. Century which could be worked toward and include everyone of us.	
795496	RESIDENT	LPCD2803	0	I fully support the sentiments expressed by the comments already made on this section. I would like to add two things. 1) the preserved railway line from the museum to Percy Main should be developed, extended, used as a wildlife corridor, more closely linked to the Amsterdam ferry terminal as tourist attraction to entice more travellers into North Tyneside 2) to do something with the cold, miserable, often closed area that is supposed to be the Royal Quays shopping centre. Surely as a coastal and riverside district we should be celebrating riverside shopping and eating rather than discouraging tourists and locals alike from using this miserable and unwelcoming, potential goldmine, of a local resource! It has parking, a bus service and Metro access. Local people would, I am sure, value a good range of shops here (hardly out of town with all the new housing and development in the area) I have it on good authority that the hours during which shops are allowed to open is restricted. Why? The fact that we now have a Â£1 shop there says it all. It should be vibrant with a variety of small shops selling local produce - food, crafts, coffee shops etc. as well as services required by people who live nearby.	2 A Picture of North Tyneside
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3270	0	Jobs In North Tyneside. 2.15. Most of these are not sustainable and will not provide valuable work experience for people starting careers. Private companies need to start doing business in the North East and provide interesting and fulfilling jobs for people. There needs to be a shift away from eveyone working in public service, retail and other parasitic service industries	2 A Picture of North Tyneside
472725	RESIDENT	LPCD4042	0	The plan fails to acknowledge the changes that have taken place to retailing in the borough, in particular that Silverlink is effectively the retail centre - despite previous planning policies. The concept of town centres and out of centre areas does not reflect the changes in North Tyneside over the past 30 years. Increasingly the town centres are not actually centres for the majority of the borough's population. Silverlink may not be a 'traditional town centre' but unfortunately this is becoming the case for those town centres too. The plan should drop the fiction that the town centres are the borough's retail centres. Given recent housing developments at Northumberland Park and Shiremoor it seems North Tyneside is destined to become an expanse of mostly identical housing estates and 'out of town' retail and other uses, which will mostly be accessed by those with cars. There is nothing in the local plan to suggest the borough will get the new sustainable communities, with a real sense of place and adequate retail and other facilities, that it has needed for many years.	2 A Picture of North Tyneside
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4926	0	Depreavation arises from lack of opportunity for gainful employment formerly provided by heavy industries within and without North Tyneside. Service industries and large business parks of office blocks are unlikely to provide an alternative to manufacturing industries. Low wages and part time working undermine the achievment of a thriving economy.	2 A Picture of North Tyneside

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
638780	0	LPCD2253	0	We need to keep our history, we need to restore Dome area before it is far too late, The Avenue Hotel (that was), The High Point Hotel (that was) to accommodate modern life. The High Point Hotel could become a Diving Centre opposite where diving takes place. We need a decent 4-star hotel in Whitley Bay - we need a train on wheels to run regularly throughout the year from St. Mary's Island and the North Shields fish quay which would help tourism as well as be a form of transport for the local residents. We need festivals that would bring people back to Whitley Bay. The town is being torn apart by people not wanting Whitley Bay to be restored back to its former glory - you just need to see Facebook groups to see that.	2 A Picture of North Tyneside
805211	0	LPCD3412	0	On points 2.8, 2.9 and 2.10; Care must be taken when considering predictions of population and household growth in North Tyneside, for the purposes of the Local Plan. The assumptions on which the Plan is based come from the ONS only, with seemingly no other forecasts being used to validate the ONS predictions. In addition, care must be taken when interpreting the actual population and household data used in the Plan. What the statistics show is that there has been an exponential increase in both population and households over the last five years, for reasons which are undetermined. There is therefore no guarantee that this level of growth will continue over the term of the Local Plan. The Plan assumes annual household growth of around 900 per annum, based on the previous 5 years. However, over the last 20 years the average annual household growth was just 471 per annum. Between 1991 and 2006, average annual household growth was at most 425 per annum, and just 149 in the 5 years to 1996. The level of growth assumed over the life of the Plan is thus almost double the long run average. Therefore there is a real and significant danger that this Plan is based on flawed predictions of household growth, which could lead to significantly more houses being built than are required. I would urge the Council to undertake further work to validate the ONS forecasts on which the Plan assumptions are based and conduct further analysis on the drivers of the recent increase in household growth (for example is it related to the economic downturn, as local people came back to North Tyneside from more expensive areas or as employment elsewhere reduced?) to determine a more realistic set of assumptions around household growth over the next 15 years.	2 A Picture of North Tyneside
805566	0	LPCD3955	0	There are parts of North Tyneside that have been neglected for far too long. Our coastline is beautiful but unfortunately littered with run down buildings. If we want to encourage visitors to the area then we need to provide great amenities. The Dome and Tynemouth Outdoor Pool would be a great start. The Fish Quay and areas around Royal Quays and the Port of Tyne could be spruced up too. It wouldn't necessarily take much money - even a tidy up to make some places nicer to go for a walk would make the area better	2 A Picture of North Tyneside
803420	RESIDENT	LPCD2454	0	North Tyneside Council are not a suitable authority to take part in any development. The Earsdon development inspite of huge public protest, resulted in a meeting with a North Tyneside Barrister who	3 Vision and Objectives

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				merely said they had no objections and that he had another meeting and walked out! Where is the affordable housing- 4-5 bed luxury housing. You are... going through the motions to tick boxes and make money with no care about people.	
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3274	0	Over all vision and objectives should be for the betterment of the people living and working here and not to put money into the hands of property developers. Council houses should make up most of the houses built so people can rent from the council who will have proper renting standards. As opposed to affordable homes which will still require people to get a mortgage. But priority should be to try convert current empty properties into liveable properties before building anything.	3 Vision and Objectives
472725	RESIDENT	LPCD4047	0	Much of the vision doesn't make sense for a local plan, as it contains ambitions that are mostly unconnected with what the plan will actually be used for. It doesn't reflect the nature of developments currently being built in the borough. The vision should focus on creating new sustainable communities, with their own identities and facilities, and encouraging developments which do the same for existing communities.	3 Vision and Objectives
805780	RESIDENT	LPCD4103	0	All of our high streets contain empty shops many with empty flats above. All of our industrial estates contain empty units. In all of the new business parks stand many thousands of square metres of empty properties. All around us there are disused pieces of industrial or factory land. Why not have the vision and determination to improve these BEFORE we start building on land that is used to grow food, is a bounty of wildlife, as well as being places to walk and ride, providing thousands of us a healthy place to explore with our families? Look around, we are never too far away from a site that could be improved with one house or one estate. In the interest of the residents of North Tyneside who you represent, I beg of you to take the harder option, it might take a little longer and perhaps cost a little more please develop the smaller disused sites rather than taking away what we love and what we need for health and well-being (fields and recreation space) (see <a href="http://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/our-news/blog/12-08-20/?view=Standard">http://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/our-news/blog/12-08-20/?view=Standard</a> ) this is the right and only way forward.	3 Vision and Objectives
807096	RESIDENT	LPCD4786	0	“Improve the borough’s image”! The borough’s image depends most on your decision making and on the ability of officers and elected members to carry out the decisions. Is that the council that encourages building on green spaces? Is that the council that still hasn’t brought plans for the Spanish City site to fruition after how long? (Benefiting all the people shouldn’t be party political). Environment / Housing / Image. Please keep working on the appearance, spacing and density of new development some of which is profoundly depressing to look at. The “Bournemouth Gardens” building will need some special last minute features to avoid the appearance of an overbearing workhouse. Some up-market sites remind me of 19th century “courts” with car parking replacing the yards.	3 Vision and Objectives
800362	0	LPCD2283	0	Point 6 needs to be a major priority and not just Tynemouth. Whitley Bay needs to be prioritised and invested in, and not simply by adding more housing, or old peoples homes. The Council needs to be more commercial and encourage the business community to come to the area. Make the area	3 Vision and Objectives

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				attractive to local businesses again and make Whitley Bay a family friendly place again.	
590341	0	LPCD2638	0	Fantastic objective, para 3.4, but how will they be measured?	3 Vision and Objectives
				When plans are being made for developing areas - housing in particular - can there please be more consideration given towards the community facilities in the area. I am a Scout Leader in Whitley Bay, and the new housing estate at West Park is likely to mean more children want to join our group in Earsdon. We already need larger premises for the numbers we have but we have really struggled to find anywhere suitable. Taylor Wimpey have no plans for any community facilities on the new estate (we asked). Obviously packing the area with houses makes more profit. When will something more than money be considered? Even a bit of green open space within the estate where children can play would be a start. We are supposed to be encouraging young people to be more active, but if the spaces are not available and the facilities are not there for local clubs to expand, then this is going to be extremely difficult. If we want North Tyneside to be a nice place to live we need to provide leisure facilities, not just pack people in like sardines. Parks, community centres, playgrounds etc are a must.	3 Vision and Objectives
805566	0	LPCD4185	0		
				3 .Vision and Objectives The vision and objectives identified in 3.2 do not recognise the realities that Sustainable Development addresses but which the people who live in North Tyneside are increasingly confronted with. In the light of experience are we to leave the national government to mediate them? Achieving Sustainable Development requires everyone to be involved and continues to raise questions about whether our present form of democracy is adequate to the task “ do we have sustainable local government? It is appreciated that these ambitions in section 3.2 are subscribed to by the Council and its Councillors. The challenge surely is for them to be shared and subscribed to by everyone. While I understand why they are presented this way in the draft, it rather looks like North Tyneside is theirs not ours. I hope that by the end of this exercise we can say democracy has been served. Perhaps we need a new form of relationship and a new kind of conversation between the Authorities and their constituents if we are to meet the challenges of Sustainable Development? The process of arriving at a Local Plan that enjoys public support might well offer the opportunity However not sure why 3.2 and 3.3 are included when 3.4 says it better. 3. The Vision for 2030 Could this be a vision of a democracy in which we have more local government rather than less? In which as citizens in a shared democracy we are able to be more self responsible, more self sufficient and have a greater say in our own affairs and that of our communities? That these inclusive communities are places where we are glad to raise our children, that people can know each other, that we have more control at least of those things essential to our existence but with the confidence to realise our potential where ever our sense of wonder and adventure takes us. We are the people who built great ships and travelled the world in them. We were at the forefront of the industrial revolution with ideas, enterprise, skill and craftsmanship. This Vision feels a bit like its intention is to put us all out to grass. Can we lead again, could the objectives speak to our ancestors too? The Objectives After all, there is a revolution taking place. Our survival demands it.	3 Vision and Objectives
805704	0	LPCD4354	0		

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>So far it has yet to become a popular revolution which is what surely sustainable development requires. As a Geordie with a sense of our history I would hate to see us miss out on a good revolution. The immensity of it is difficult to grasp but could the Local Plan recognise the challenge and the opportunity. Can it question how the self interest, the sense of community and the enterprise of local people can be appealed to. If so, the draft plan would benefit from identifying the need to encourage innovation and research, enable enterprise and risk taking within local communities. What might this mean for the Objectives and are the means available to achieve them? We are being asked to question our values and in particular those values regarding our relationship with the natural world which we are beginning to appreciate is not simply there for us to over consume without awful consequence. Climate Change is in danger of becoming the new market force an "Act of God", which some how we have had no part in causing. That then requires us to respond to its consequences rather than change the behaviour that causes it. The changes required will not, be perceived until we recognise we are part of nature and not, as we seem to think, separate from it. That damaging/destroying it damages us. That has not been made clear and in a believable way. These values should translate into forms of development in which the social and environmental consequences will be carefully weighed together with the economic and the decisions made in favour of our survival rather than who will profit from it. The Local Plan struggles to find the new currency. That the decision making about such development can not be left to the market place and especially in the case of those essentials for life, should be made in favour of sustainable development. That decision with advice must be the prerogative of those who speak about the public interest locally and are equipped to. That must mean education about living sustainably, understanding how to plan a sustainable community and live in one, as well as knowing what means are available to enable someone to achieve one - Neighbourhood Plans, Sustainable Communities Act, Town and Country Planning, Localism Act etc More of our people are hurting and this is not due entirely to the austerity measures of this government but for the reasons previously mentioned. Their plight alone should be a strong motivation for some ideas group within the borough to consider what needs to be done our best people. We do not, I suspect, know who they are[ for we need to know who lives in North Tyneside?.] If consideration is given to those often regarded as vulnerable and/or disadvantaged "i.e people who are - elderly, disabled, women, children, ill, poor, isolated, people without a motor car?, indeed all of us at some time in our lives; the centralising of services, the withdrawal of facilities to out of town, has increased the difficulties and defined those people. What would an inclusive sustainable community look like that is designed to minimise or indeed obviate what leads to their disadvantage? (What was learnt from the pilot Neighbourhood Plan at the Fish Quay and what might we learn from initiatives elsewhere) It is difficult to assess the implications of these Local Plan proposals without having an ideal for what would constitute a sustainable community. However the term has been colonised to fit existing administrative</p>	

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>arrangements[ the status quo] not to explore living with respect in a socially meaningful way in the 21st Century However a Conference convened recently by Friends of the Earth and attended by many local people began to identify some critical aspects of what a sustainable community might include. The conference involved people who wished to appreciate why it is necessary to live lightly and to choose to live sustainably -, to live in a Zero Carbon Britain -. That is, reducing consumption, waste and cost within the home but also realising the advantages of participating in a range of community living projects that included community food growing initiatives, community energy projects, community transport, sharing costs and equipment, as well as growing and supporting a local economy .The relationship between these activities and health and well being were recognised as being part of a whole community approach. What was also recognised was how little people new about neighbourhood planning and what was available to them to influence the development of where they lived or indeed defend it. This suggested what was needed were local political arrangements with enough power to make participating in them worthwhile and which could give logical expression to recent legislation such as the Localism Act, the Sustainable Communities Act and also the Local Plan. Could local people be enabled to design their own future? This Local Plan is comprehensive in its scope and intimidating in its scale. Itâ€™s a significant start but I think what is proposed with Land is in danger of compromising our ability to respond to the huge uncertainties that we are faced with. Annoyingly, it is likely to have been drafted in the face of those powerful market pressures which compromise our democracy and our quality of life. I will applaud the Authorities willingness to resist them in favour of sustainable communities. Never the less within the timescales, the process of arriving at a Local Plan that should enjoy in large measure, public support, may be as important for the future of our democracy as the outcome since it will reveal who WE are. The response to it so far, will have identified hopefully many people who care about where they live. I hope the conversation continues and grows but I would be very interested in what they have said already.</p>	
793138	RESIDENT	LPCD845	0	Urban sprawl should be prevented at all costs. It is important that greenfield sites are preserved to provide a sustainable future.	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3275	0	Only build on green field and green belt when all brown field and current empty buildings are used up. Keep current green pockets as they are withing housing developments.	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4927	0	Missing from the interpretation of 'sustainable' is that of long term avoidance of future burdens on council finances that arise from investments on behalf of NTC customers in what can turn out to be	4 Sustainable Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				'white elephants' that lead to subsidies by NTC.	Strategy for North Tyneside
806113	RESIDENT	LPCD4290	0	I object very strongly to plans for the very large housing development in North Tyneside's One Core Strategy I have seen no evidence for any proper consultation with other councils.	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
809736	RESIDENT	LPCD6593	0	I also object most strongly on the basis of the extreme lack of infrastructure, such as main drainage, high risk of flooding due to increased areas of hard standing overloading existing systems and traffic problems.	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
463341	0	LPCD3519	0	Striking the right balance between growth and restraint - These plans would take away much of what green belt North Tyneside has left; - I can't see any re-generation in Whitley Bay/Tynemouth " all the commercial sites seem to be in the North West;	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
592444	0	LPCD3599	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Agricultural Value: A number of areas in the Local Plan is land currently used for the production of crops and in this time of food shortages is an important aspect for consideration.	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
592444	0	LPCD3625	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Agricultural Value: A number of areas in the Local Plan is land currently used for the production of crops and in this time of food shortages is an important aspect for consideration.	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
805543	0	LPCD3853	0	Sustainable Development means building ONLY on brown field sites. There are plenty of them. There is plenty of office space for the admitted "service jobs only" at the ghostly empty Cobalt Business Park!	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
					1.1
					1.2
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2724	In part	a ? - don't understand c Add at the end "using innovative and sustainable souses."	AS/1.3 The North Shields Sub Area



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
638474	RESIDENT	LPCD2044	Yes	Use employment/housing sites to grow existing progress.	AS/1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2723	In part	AS/1.3 a ? - I do not understand this. c please add "using innovative and sustainable souses."	AS/1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2725	Yes		AS/1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay
794059	RESIDENT	LPCD1199	0	The coast is already over developed - more cark parking is needed not more houses	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
795653	RESIDENT	LPCD1730	0	I welcome the proposal to protect our environment. This should also link to eco tourism, celebrating and protecting the special coastline and marine areas and its wildlife.	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
798761	RESIDENT	LPCD3454	0	Much of Whitley Road, (e.g. stretching from Health Centre to approx junction with A193), near Whitley Bay Centre , consists of untidy, close shops and almost derelict buildings an appalling eyesore, + depressing for inhabitants. Please, could not this area be re-developed as a matter of urgency? New, affordable housing + flats would restore the are to healthy living again these homes would be near the towns shops, on local bus routes, near Whitley Bay Metro trains, near the beach and local schools an excellent area in which to live. Could such a vision become a reality?? Use brownfieldsites, NOT farm land.	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4929	In part	On Map 5 there appears to be 4 shades of green. Please ensure the whole of Marden Quarry including its woodland area is shown as a park as well as a nature reserve/green space. (Marden Quarry was created as a park by NTC in 1975 and recognised as a nature reserve in 2005. It is currently very poorly maintained.) As previously advised in a comment on the Area Action Plan, Whitley Bay town centre was never designed for the motor car and I suggested that alternative road routing is sign-posted for the majority of traffic that simply passes through the town centre without visiting it.	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
471296	RESIDENT	LPCD5612	Yes	Focus should be on regenerating Whitley Bay and coastal strip	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
807150	RESIDENT	LPCD4823	In part	I would like to put in a plea for our costal area. It is such a beautiful coastline and yet we seem no further forward with really kick starting Whitley Bay in particular. I know the Dome appears to be moving now but I still feel that there is a lack of cohesion between council, community and commerce . There are some dreadful properties on the sea front - but the location is fantastic. I have recently	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				visited a number of small towns where the passion for their community is evident and drives commercial success.	
631932	0	LPCD292	In part	The Council has planning for a boat launch ramp at Tynemouth Haven, we must be the only authority with over 4 miles of river frontage with no launching facilities. If you want to be taken seriously about industry and tourism this is a priority as i will develop the Haven and create jobs.	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
797110	0	LPCD2726	Yes		AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area 0
803493	0	LPCD2806	Yes	It is also important to protect the seascape views associated with the coastline. These iconic views such as St Mary's lighthouse and Tynemouth Priory are of significant value to the Borough. The protection of these seascape views will be particularly important when considering sites for potential off-shore wind turbine developments.	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
804813	0	LPCD2763	In part	The policies are so unspecific and vague that it is almost impossible to see clearly any detail as to what is planned. However, what is missing is: i) any reference to SPECIFIC measures to protect rare and threatened wildlife along the coast (including seabirds already threatened by the number of off-lead dogs chasing them off the rocks at low tide). ii) any detailed reference to how housing development (for example, in the Whitley Bay area) will be supported by an already badly strained infrastructure (e.g. GPs surgeries are already over-stretched, and some Out of Hours health centres and surgeries are closing) iii) any reference to how quality of life, rather than business or economic interests, is to be maintained, given the proposed scope of building, housing and retail development. Already, the natural beauty of the area has been badly compromised (for example by the development at the Earsdon View estate, and now at West Park). Traffic congestion and flooding has been worsened and local services and health and education provision are already spoiled or over-stretched. This is unlikely to promote the coastal area as a place that tourists want to come to for peaceful coastal walking and wildlife observation.	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
804992	0	LPCD2977	No	How many times have we heard from successive councils that they want to develop Whitley Bay and its sea front areas. Years have passed and still no re-development. Here's is a thought, "No re-development means no new visitors (tourists or other), this then allows the selling off of car park areas". The car park on The Links recently sold for development, why was The Avenue Public House" site not used ie true re-development.	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
805507	0	LPCD4546	In part	With so many visitors to the coast in all seasons it seems a missed opportunity to not develop the sea front from Cullercoats to Whitley Bay. The closed down hotels, pubs etc are so unsightly. We have not commented on other areas as we do not live near those areas nor frequent them so feel it is not fair to offer opinion. We care about where we live and where we raise our children and we wish everybody felt the same. If you don't comment or vote, you can't complain!	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
805543	0	LPCD3847	In part	1. The continued use by the markets has kept Tynemouth Station alive and I agree with the Council's	AS/1.5 The

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				intent to continue to support. 2. How many times has the subject of Whitley Bay regeneration and the white elephant of Spanish City raised its ugly head. Vast sums of money have been wasted attempting to hang on to failure. Look around at the eyesores of boarded-up buildings along the front. What is needed here is joined up thinking not a slavish attempt to hold onto a failed past.	Coastal Sub Area
805553	0	LPCD4499	In part	In Whitley Bay more needs to be done to use or redevelop empty and derelict buildings, homes and shops.	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
803420	RESIDENT	No	We do not need more development in Burradon/ Camperdown as the traffic is terrible now and further development would cause much more congestion. The traffic does not keep to the		AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			speed limit of 30MPH through Camper down and there is no deterrent even though I have asked for high lighted speed signs.		
806999	RESIDENT	0	You have already allowed the cutting-off of the NW corner, isolating our Church in the process, as well as allowing the		AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			wanton destruct ion of a unique piece of architec ture from the same period, in the Old School House, still a pile of rubble and the next generati on will look back on this time of destruct ion and hold the current Authorit ies ultimate ly responsi ble for		

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			the losses.		
797110	RESIDENT	Yes	0		AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area 0
805504	RESIDENT	No		Dudley is losing its local post office In January, we also have poor transport links down past Hedgefield through to Dudley. Where is the infrastructure here that needs to be addressed first	AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area 0

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2728	No	This should be the other way round. If no relevant policy or it is out of date then a hold should be placed on the project until suitable policy is created or it can be updated.	DM/2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4931	No	This is badly expressed and needs a complete re-write. According to Planning Policy reply to my recent questions on what sustainable means it was stated that - the word sustainable is described in the NPPF as "ensuring better lives for ourselves don't mean worse lives for future generations" - and 'sustainable development' is defined as "change for the better, and not only in our built environment". This should form the basis of DM/2.1 which of course, being a policy, is a 'material consideration'!	DM/2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
792734	RESIDENT	LPCD485	Yes	Reuse sites that were previously developed	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
793045	RESIDENT	LPCD671	0	I would like to see existing properties developed. If we look at high streets with empty/unused properties can we not look to use these for housing. In Whitley Bay there are many empty hotels - can these not provide homes? I am totally against developing green fields sites when so many brown field "eyesores" are available.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
793668	RESIDENT	LPCD925	0	Brownfield sites should be utilised - land needs to be kept for wildlife - nature reserves in themselves are not enough - wildlife corridors and buffer zones are required.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
793738	RESIDENT	LPCD948	Yes	I'm uncertain to which of the sites if any are 'brown' but I do feel they ought to be used first, at the same time respecting flood/subsidence potential.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
794009	RESIDENT	LPCD1144	In part	In general I would like as much of the land as possible to remain 'green' but realise that employment and industrial development are very important of course. I would also like as many properties as possible to be converted into housing or other use and to prevent them from deteriorating.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
794048	RESIDENT	LPCD1193	In part	I think more thought should be given to redeveloping derelict land and buildings rather than new builds on green belt land	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
587868	RESIDENT	LPCD1327	0	No more green field sites should be used to provide housing in this area. Only brown field	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
794159	RESIDENT	LPCD1284	0	Do not build on fields or trees or nature. This is most important. This means more fields, trees and green space and less buildings. Back to nature and fresh air and countryside.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
794562	RESIDENT	LPCD1506	0	Do not increase housing on farmland or open spaces - if you have to use brownfield sites like Chirton trading estate	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
795303	RESIDENT	LPCD1690	No	The Whitley Road areas are already a nightmare traffic wise. We are already suffering with flooding because drains etc overflowing. Try and develop inner areas - run down sites/housing areas. Don't take the easy option of green sites. Get stuck into problem areas and update!!!	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
798039	RESIDENT	LPCD2213	In part	Any small brown fields should be used for housing.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
798995	RESIDENT	LPCD2205	In part	Seek brownfield site and possibly look at run down town centres	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
805085	RESIDENT	LPCD3201	0	I am fairly radical in that I believe developers would rather build on Green belt near the coast (NE30 post code) than regenerate brownfield sites in the derelict town centres like N Shields and Wallsend.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
805710	RESIDENT	LPCD4065	0	In general I object to proposals to build on green field sites when there is a lot of brown field former industrial land available for building on, usually with better public transport access than the proposed green field sites.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
806986	RESIDENT	LPCD4691	0	I wish to object to the draft North Tyneside's LDF, and the proposals contained within it. The focus of my objections are as follows :- ~the nature of the proposed development, with its focus on green field developments ,will significantly increase urban sprawl .Whilst the lack of strategic focus on the redevelopment of existing brown field sites will squander the opportunity to support and bolster many existing ,and sometimes,fragile communities .	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
807096	RESIDENT	LPCD4767	0	(1)Ensure planning decisions consider the environmental conditions You can of course consider and then ignore. This bit for me is more important than the money. If you want to keep residents happy and attract more, it is vital to retain open green space the lungsof the area, opportunities for recreation, protection of wildlife and a sense of space. Theres good reason why Whitley Bay links isn't a potential development site	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
807096	RESIDENT	LPCD4788	0	Some of the seven "large sites with planning permission" are already being built upon. Only the North Shields riverside site wasn't a green space. That doesn't look hopeful for future development decisions.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
807951	RESIDENT	LPCD5322	0	Use brownfield before greenfield sites.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
808006	RESIDENT	LPCD5338	0	North Tyneside is already overcrowded. Please no more building on the last of our green fields. Plenty of brown field sites around the county.	DM/2.2 General Development



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Principles
808202	RESIDENT	LPCD5683	0	There are plenty of so called brownfield sites that have in the past been used for industry or other buildings that could have been demolished which could be used for building without using green belt land.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
808652	RESIDENT	LPCD5876	0	Make use of brown fields 1st. Green field sites to remain, protected Green Belt.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
809130	RESIDENT	LPCD6320	0	I would prefer that you avoid as much green space as possible and redevelop existing sites. However, I understand that this is not always possible.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
590531	RESIDENT	LPCD2221	0	Please impact brownfield sites first when considering new homes, there is no evidence that this is happening	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2729	Yes		DM/2.2 General Development Principles
592080	RESIDENT	LPCD3267	0	In response to the above I would advise you that I strongly object to the building of houses and buildings for employment purposes being built on green field sites until all possible brown field sites have been redeveloped. At that point the land needed for homes and jobs could be reassessed. As the Council are not proposing to develop all of the potential development sites outlined in the plan and to date they have not yet decided which will be included, no further planning applications should be considered for the green field sites until such time as a decision has been made on which sites will be protected.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
592444	RESIDENT	LPCD3603	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Brown Field Sites: There are numerous sites in and around North Tyneside that could be given serious consideration for further development of housing where there is dereliction with factory and office buildings standing empty. North Tyneside's plan will result in loss of buffer zones and end up with urban sprawl to the detriment of everyone.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
592447	RESIDENT	LPCD3628	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Brown Field Sites: There are numerous sites in and around North Tyneside that could be given serious consideration for further development of housing where there is dereliction with factory and office buildings standing empty. North Tyneside's plan will result in loss of buffer zones and end up with urban sprawl to the detriment of everyone.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
638500	RESIDENT	LPCD3283	0	In response to the above I would advise you that I strongly object to the building of houses and buildings for employment purposes being built on green field sites until all possible brown field sites have been redeveloped. At that point the land needed for homes and jobs could be reassessed. As the	DM/2.2 General Development Principles

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				Council are not proposing to develop all of the potential development sites outlined in the plan and to date they have not yet decided which will be included, no further planning applications should be considered for the green field sites until such time as a decision has been made on which sites will be protected.	
804992	RESIDENT	LPCD2986	In part	Re-develop existing sites, do not take the easy option and sell off green and brown field sites. The existing infra structure cannot take the current traffic volumes so excessive development will just compound the situation	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
805479	RESIDENT	LPCD4516	No	I appreciate brown field development is more costly but this should be a priority and developed before any other areas. This ensures that eyesores are eliminated and land recycled before new land is wasted.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
805559	RESIDENT	LPCD3937	No	Brown field sites should be redeveloped; there are an awful lot of underused and declining industrial estates in our borough; which could be updated or their use changed to residential; if suitable. Keep all agricultural sites; once gone, they will never be replaced. These have the added bonus of wildlife, recreational activities eg., cycling and walking along tracks and providing open space.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
589608	RESIDENT	LPCD6017	In part	Prioritise brown land, small developments. Housing needs shops and community facilities if they do not already exist. Make sure all current property is in use (residential and retail) before building more.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
792504	RESIDENT	LPCD340	0	The amount of land set aside for housing is too much considering the number of empty properties in the borough. Communities are losing their identities as one former village "blurs" into another with no break other than a council erected sign denoting the village's former existence. More breaks are needed to avoid acres and acres of non-stop housing.	3 Green Belt, Safeguarded Land and Killingworth Break
805490	RESIDENT	LPCD3795	0	extend proposed killingworth break to include all of sites 23,24,25,. 26 ,27 ,28. ideally make it green belt .It is a important wildlife corridor to Rising Sun country park and gosforth park .Was identified as such in the last U.D.P. Has many footpaths in these sites ideal for residents to enjoy walking,jogging, horse rideing,mountain bikeing.site 26 has old Fawdon colliery waggonway which runs though center of site and end to end..In south east corner of site is the cross base of old Holystone--Tynemouth boundry marker	3 Green Belt, Safeguarded Land and Killingworth Break
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4935	In part	The policies map does not show the boundaries of the settlements and so I am unable to check that the statement b is correct!	S/3.1 The Green Belt
808202	RESIDENT	LPCD5656	0	I think that plans for building new housing estates on existing green belt land should be stopped now. Because if this is allowed then in the future these people who have vested interests in house building	S/3.1 The Green Belt

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				will be back again and again until we have no green belt land at all. I grew up in this area and when I was young Benton Estate was surrounded with fields which at that time were said to be green belt land. At that time the farms had cattle and pigs. The fields were used for potatoes, turnips and corn, and it was said the land could not be built upon, this was obviously a lie as the whole place has been destroyed by the vandals who have built all over the place.	
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2730	Yes		S/3.1 The Green Belt
805211	RESIDENT	LPCD3540	In part	For the purposes of the Local Plan, the definition of Green Belt land should also include specific reference to it's utility to wildlife and the human population of North Tyneside, as land for recreation, walking, dog-walking etc; and for the environmental services such land provides (for example open space absorbs rain water, trees and plants capture carbon dioxide etc). Green Belt land should be protected for its environmental and ecological benefits and not just because it conforms with the narrow definition of Green Belt Land as currently proposed in the Local Plan.	S/3.1 The Green Belt
805386	RESIDENT	LPCD3617	Yes	s/3.1 The Green Belt (b) states the Green Belt in North Tyneside prevents the merging of ..... Whitley Bay with Shiremoor. This cannot be achieved if all 7 potential development plots 35/36/37/38/39/40/41 are used for housing.	S/3.1 The Green Belt
641227	RESIDENT	LPCD1155	0	Do not touch Green Belt	DM/3.2 Development with the Green Belt
794303	RESIDENT	LPCD1355	In part	Stay off Green Belt	DM/3.2 Development with the Green Belt
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3282	Yes	Urban sprawl would be detrimental. Our Green Belt needs to be protected. Please do not pander to property developers who say people do not want to live on brown field sites. Also the transport and infrastructure is not available around green belt. All housing estates can be made attractive now if Landscape Architecture and Design is made an integral part of the building process.	DM/3.2 Development with the Green Belt
805085	RESIDENT	LPCD3203	0	Not [development] on the Green belt but mostly on brown fields.	DM/3.2 Development with the Green Belt
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2731	Yes		DM/3.2 Development with the Green

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Belt
804902	RESIDENT	LPCD2910	No	Please leave Green Belt Land alone. Otherwise, North Tyneside will become a grey and ugly place to live.	DM/3.2 Development with the Green Belt
463341	RESIDENT	LPCD3517	0	What will the council do when there is no green belt left which if all of these sites get the go ahead will leave very little and Gosforth Park SSSI defunct because there will be no wildlife access.	DM/3.2 Development with the Green Belt
805211	RESIDENT	LPCD3545	In part	Development within Green Belt land must also ensure that it has no adverse impacts on wildlife, biodiversity or the environmental services such land provides (e.g. absorption of rain water, capture of carbon dioxide etc). DM/3.2 should be amended to reflect the above.	DM/3.2 Development with the Green Belt
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4937	Yes	None.	S/3.3 Safeguarded Land
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2732	No	It is important to make a commitment to the safety of this kind of land so please add "and with a preference to maintain this status in any future plans."	S/3.3 Safeguarded Land
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4938	Yes	None.	DM/3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land
799643	RESIDENT	LPCD2250	Yes	Our concern and disagreement with this element of the policy is in relation to site 25 and in particular Holystone Farm which is where our home, Holystone Cottage is. We currently have open views of the surrounding farm and fallow fields on which numerous wildlife resides, the development of this land would not:- A) Preserve the open nature of the area B) Would cause significant visual intrusion to our property C) It would adversely effect access for recreation as the farm is a stables and horse farm, development of this area would prevent this as recreation. The surrounding footpaths and waggon ways are main routes for both cyclists and dog walkers, again development would prevent this as a recreation. D) Important landscape features such as the railway lines where historic trains pass by within our view would be effected by development, coupled with the conservation of wild plants	DM/3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>which have been growing for over 60 years E) This is a farm so any development will effect agricultural operations. It is abundantly clear that at least 5 of the 6 items will severely impact ours and the surrounding homes and recreation of the public as well as significantly impact the surrounding environment. It is also worth pointing out the surrounding mine shafts, back filled mine itself, main gas infrastructure on the main fallow field behind our property and wildlife such as newts, frogs, ducks, geese, Herron, kestrel, owls, foxes, hedgehogs, rabbits, deer and bats. I have tried in vain over the last 6 months to report the draining of the ponds and the removal of trees in the field behind our home to the environmental department of North Tyneside Council and have left countless messages on answering machines which I have not received any reply to and feel as a tax payer that I would at least have the decency of a call back.</p>	
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2733	Yes		DM/3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land
805211	RESIDENT	LPCD3550	In part	<p>Development within Safeguarded land must also ensure that it has no adverse impacts on wildlife, biodiversity or the environmental services provided by such land (e.g. absorbtion of rain water, capture of carbon dioxide etc). DM/3.4 should be amended to reflect the above.</p>	DM/3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land
794302	RESIDENT	LPCD1342	Yes	<p>Please do not spoil the areas around Killingworth Village and the wagonways. This area is beautiful for walks, the village is picturesque.</p>	AS/3.5 Killingworth Open Break
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2734	In part		AS/3.5 Killingworth Open Break
805211	RESIDENT	LPCD3725	In part	<p>Development within the Killingworth Open Break must also ensure that it has no adverse impacts on wildlife, biodiversity or the environmental services provided by such land (e.g. absorbtion of rain water, capture of carbon dioxide etc). DM/3.5 should be amended to reflect the above.</p>	AS/3.5 Killingworth Open Break
805535	RESIDENT	LPCD3818	In part	<p>LDP ref AS/35 Killingworth open break should be extended across the A19 to Holystone I.E to include Killingworth Moor sites 22-23-24-25-26. In the last Urban development plan this area "is a wildlife corridor to feed the Rising Sun &amp; Gosforth Parks with new wildlife". If these parks become landlocked existing wildlife stocks will die off &amp; not be replaced by the wildlife at present moving through the corridors.</p>	AS/3.5 Killingworth Open Break

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2735	Yes	This is a great idea but communities need a commitment from the council of money and resources to get any results from this process. Also what does "appropriate" mean here?	S/4.1 Supporting Neighbourhood Planning
805522	RESIDENT	LPCD3806	Yes		S/4.1 Supporting Neighbourhood Planning 0
792059	RESIDENT	LPCD222	0	We need to offer more employment to "HALF OUR FUTURE"	5 Economic Development
792059	RESIDENT	LPCD223	0	You need to encourage the following in the next 10-20 years. 1. Local TV Station 2. Seasonal camp site 4. Any large development should offer underground parking.	5 Economic Development
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4939	0	5.4 refers to the value of tourism yet there is little to advertise North Tyneside on the internet - what I have found is as follows: - <a href="http://www.visitnorthtyneside.com/">http://www.visitnorthtyneside.com/</a> --- <a href="http://www.visitnorthtyneside.com/visitor-information">http://www.visitnorthtyneside.com/visitor-information</a> - which are very similar - <a href="http://www.britishdestinations.co.uk/destinations.aspx/Whitley_Bay_and_Tynemouth_-_North_Tyneside">http://www.britishdestinations.co.uk/destinations.aspx/Whitley_Bay_and_Tynemouth_-_North_Tyneside</a> . There appears to be nothing for visitors from overseas, such as Scandinavia - that might attract visitors by ship and air. I have previously suggested more web cameras overlooking place of inyerest such as Tynemouth priory and catle, Cullercoats Bay, St Marys lighthouse ect - all linked from a Touism website maintained by NTC.	5 Economic Development
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3332	0	5.6 Tourism Facilities. I would like to see some camp sites. Also YHA or back packers hostels. Perhaps turn some of the unused buildings on the coast into a backpackers hostel. If you create an urban sprawl of houses with no cultural or natural facilities you will attract no visitors or investment. Remember investors are attracted to attractive places because it is true that they will contain a good pool of labour!	5 Economic Development
794059	RESIDENT	LPCD1200	0	Over development of the coast will actually lose jobs that exist now	5 Economic Development
795496	RESIDENT	LPCD1697	0	Tourism and Local Facilities in Royal Quays: Total negative use of space- shops and tourist info closed when Amsterdam boat arrives. No small shuttle buses from the boat. Royal Quays has no food shops, restricted opening hours, no wonder shops are close to being replaced by Â£1 shops. It should be opening, welcoming, interesting and a great entrance to North Tyneside. Currently dull, shut, waste of good retail space and golden opportunity to showcase North Tyneside.	5 Economic Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
808139	RESIDENT	LPCD5494	0	River Front should be developed for Employment - Majority of area is brownfield site Chirton Corridor to boundary should be developed for Employment - Employment Zone in Centre of Borough accessible to all Norht West area to boundary should be developed for employment, housing and retail use - To open up area to growth and habitability.	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
807951	RESIDENT	LPCD5323	0	Keep industry together on trading estates, not scattered. Encourage retailers into town centres.	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
805780	RESIDENT	LPCD4104	0	In December 2013 Right Move were advertising over 36,700 square metres of empty buildings on the Cobalt Business Park alone ( <a href="http://www.rightmove.co.uk/commercial-property-to-let/find.html?searchType=RENT&amp;locationIdentifier=OUTCODE%5E1708&amp;insId=2&amp;radius=5.0&amp;displayPropertyType=commercial&amp;minBedrooms=&amp;maxBedrooms=&amp;minPrice=&amp;maxPrice=&amp;areaSizeUnit=sqft&amp;minSize=&amp;maxSize=&amp;maxDaysSinceAdded=&amp;retirement=&amp;sortByPriceDescending=&amp;_includeLetAgreed=on&amp;primaryDisplayPropertyType=&amp;secondaryDisplayPropertyType=&amp;oldDisplayPropertyType=&amp;oldPrimaryDisplayPropertyType=&amp;letType=&amp;letFurnishType=&amp;houseFlatShare=false">http://www.rightmove.co.uk/commercial-property-to-let/find.html?searchType=RENT&amp;locationIdentifier=OUTCODE%5E1708&amp;insId=2&amp;radius=5.0&amp;displayPropertyType=commercial&amp;minBedrooms=&amp;maxBedrooms=&amp;minPrice=&amp;maxPrice=&amp;areaSizeUnit=sqft&amp;minSize=&amp;maxSize=&amp;maxDaysSinceAdded=&amp;retirement=&amp;sortByPriceDescending=&amp;_includeLetAgreed=on&amp;primaryDisplayPropertyType=&amp;secondaryDisplayPropertyType=&amp;oldDisplayPropertyType=&amp;oldPrimaryDisplayPropertyType=&amp;letType=&amp;letFurnishType=&amp;houseFlatShare=false</a> ) How about developing one or two of these buildings? At 125,875sq mts, Cobalt Unit 23 could house many affordable apartments, the ground floor could be used commercially, launderette, newsagents etc it has over 400 parking spaces and is ideally located for work and transport links.	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
805386	RESIDENT	LPCD3623	Yes	Places such as Cobalt, Quorum and Balliol are hugely under used so investment into increasing their usage rather than the building of new office complexes should be considered.	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
793868	RESIDENT	LPCD1088	In part	Good idea to provide jobs first. Where is the money coming from. Loans have to be repaid	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
792364	RESIDENT	LPCD296	Yes	none given	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
791875	RESIDENT	LPCD175	0	As Wideopen is situated at the outer limits of the area perhaps facilities for a bank, wet fish shop and a clothing manufacturer would assist in improvement employment.	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
631932	RESIDENT	LPCD294	0	Remove bylaw that prevents small business from being run from ones home	S/5.1 :

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Economic Growth Strategy
471121	RESIDENT	LPCD5062	0	All existing employment sites must be ring fenced along with new site earmarked for employment purposes Jobs must be found through investment in employment sites for people already resident in the Borough before another large influx of outsiders come into purchase house and travel outside Borough for employment thus causing more traffic congestion which is already a serious problem. No more large out of town retail centres, night time economy huge investment to remain sustainable	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
471031	RESIDENT	LPCD6188	Yes	The map is too small and difficult to read and West Moor has not been identified. We do not know very much about the potential development sites and the weather has precluded us from visiting them all. We do agree, however, that the River Tyne and the A19 Corridor should be priorities for growth.	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
469684	RESIDENT	LPCD5747	Yes	As regards employment, some buildings on the Cobalt Business Park stand unoccupied and there is more land available there. So developing the A19 corridor and the north bank of the Tyne first it seems a good idea.	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
463341	RESIDENT	LPCD3529	0	Economic Growth - We already have several site such as Quorum & Balliol business parks where there are empty office blocks	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
444718	RESIDENT	LPCD4264	In part	The documents seem to require the provision of a certain number of jobs and a certain number of houses. I would suggest that for jobs, the council works on filling up existing sites such as all the empty office buildings built on the Colbalt business park and the derelict/unused areas along the banks of the river and on Norham Road and Tyne Tunnel Trading Estates.	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
468309	RESIDENT	LPCD269	0	I am in support of the plan to increase workplaces on the Wheatslade site. The issue of expanding work opportunities in this area was an issue I raised with the Council in it last consultation paper, and still believe that work opportunities are a vital part of a sustainable North Tyneside.	5 New Employment Land
805543	RESIDENT	LPCD3854	0	Any and all new development must be on existing brown field sites.	5 New Employment Land
794220	RESIDENT	LPCD1315	No	Not as much as 170 hectares	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2741	No	What is employment land anyway? Part of this land should include provision for (semi-organic) smallholding's as this will provide a useful source of employment while maintaining areas of both biodiversity and green land cover. There is also employment in environmental conservation projects.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807269	RESIDENT	LPCD4964	No	I have lived in West Moor for 50 years, and this village has been gradually surrounded by development over that time. I would like to see the remaining green spaces to be kept intact i.e. 8, 9, 10, 11 is this too much to ask I feel I can only comment on the area in which I live.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805543	RESIDENT	LPCD3848	No	Any and all new development must be on existing brown field sites.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
471073	RESIDENT	LPCD1313	No	It is already virtually impossible to move in and out of the Borough at peak times. We have too many empty office buildings without building more. Consider the quality of life, not enough health and care services for people as it is.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791179	RESIDENT	LPCD33	No	Not enough infrastructure to accommodate development	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805479	RESIDENT	LPCD4512	No	There is every need for more employment opportunity in the borough but as yet there are empty industrial estates in the borough both for manufacturing and office space. i.e Cobalt. There is also an excess of retail space i.e. town centres.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807951	RESIDENT	LPCD5315	No	Impossible to agree without knowing where the land is to be provided or what sort of site it is now and might become.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
790915	RESIDENT	LPCD15	No	North Tyneside is being over-developed	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793009	RESIDENT	LPCD621	No	The Council should look at the needs for houses and environmental benefits locally ie. green infrastructure to meet the plans of North Tyneside.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
805211	RESIDENT	LPCD3726	No	<p>The Local Plan should provide a smaller area of land for development than the 170 hectares currently proposed and the criteria for development should be strict and definitive. For example, there is already adequate office space in North Tyneside currently unused so no development land should be used for this purpose. Similarly, there is already ample retail space in North Tyneside so only a small proportion of the land for development should be earmarked for this sector. A larger proportion of development land should be allotted for the marine and offshore renewables industries but by their nature this is more likely to be along the North bank of the Tyne, meaning that development on some of the green spaces away from this area currently proposed in the Plan would be unnecessary. Consideration should also be given to the use of development land for small holdings, conservation projects or even further nature reserves as these are all capable of creating sustainable employment and economic benefits for the borough.</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805535	RESIDENT	LPCD4471	No	<p>Local Draft plan-ref 5.20-"210 hectares of land is available for new economic development at present time, 700 hectares is in employment use now, a proportion of this is vacant awaiting new occupation-the vacant space includes units at both Quorum &amp; Cobalt business parks as a result of local enterprise zone tax rules, offices have been built ahead of demand." Also many more buildings are standing empty on other trading estates &amp; business parks, some units have not been occupied since construction, others discarded after only a few years as occupiers move on to get free rates etc on new sites-leaving more &amp; more empty buildings &amp; eating up even more greenfield sites. This is happening all across Tyne &amp; Wear &amp; across the U.K. In North Tyneside we are "ahead of demand", with many state of art brand new offices at the Cobalt &amp; Quorum business parks, we have ample supply of land available for new economic development i.e 210 hectares for the next 15 years.</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
471296	RESIDENT	LPCD5587	No	<p>Please re-use, re-develop and fill existing sites before adding more. New businesses could take advantage of cash incentives, but not be lasting, too.</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805490	RESIDENT	LPCD3796	No	<p>N.T has already ample allocated land for employment growth and abundant brownfield sites to use in future .do not take our greenfield sites reuse derelict lands which are plentiful.</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
462662	RESIDENT	LPCD4955	No	<p>Employment in the area is not and will not be good enough to support the new housing! Green areas and landscape design need to be the priority for this process! Potential sites should not be ones already the areas rejected by the Council. For different reasons. Flood plains, green areas etc. etc. Where is the new employment coming from??</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3349	No	<p>I don't understand this statement or question above. But i will add what I think is a suitable comment for this section. 1. The empty new offices in Cobalt need to be occupied first before building any more</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				offices or factories in this borough. You mention tax zone laws with this section as a reason some of the Cobalt offices were built ahead of time. Well those tax zone laws need to be changed or some-one needs to see sense. 2. More retail parks does not constitute sustainable growth. We have enough out-of-town large retail outlets in the form of Silverlink, Boundary Mills, Royal Quays etc. Town centres need to be developed and local, private, small business attracted to them.	Employment Development
466426	RESIDENT	LPCD4416	No	There are a large number of empty office blocks/factory units standing empty, several for long periods, in the existing Business Parks at Quorum, Balliol and Cobalt. Surely these should be utilised before new areas are developed.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805504	RESIDENT	LPCD4451	No	There are hundreds of empty offices standing vacant because money was allocated for them but the government has striped assets and we have no business to use them and they are not affordable for business to use so why not turn some into flats instead and make use of them. After building is finished so will jobs.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805508	RESIDENT	LPCD4442	No	We don't need any more offices etc as so many are not occupied in the Balliol BP and Cobalt BPs plus how many are Newcastle adding at Kingston park and filling in their Greenbelt on the other side of Gosforth Park. The so-called Great Park.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805553	RESIDENT	LPCD4500	No	A drive around Cobalt business park will demonstrate the large number of empty units and offices. More needs to be done to fill these before any new business parks are created.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807887	RESIDENT	LPCD5223	No	Industrial units and offices standing empty, we don't need to build more.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791316	RESIDENT	LPCD53	No	Plenty empty offices at Cobalt	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793045	RESIDENT	LPCD650	No	Too much industrial land not being used/developed	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793403	RESIDENT	LPCD712	No	Cobalt Business Park - what a complete waste of space has been taken up on this area. The number of large greenhouse office blocks sprawled out and standing empty is ridiculous. there must be so much wasted space that the supposed housing requirements could have been built and with space still to	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>spare. The Council who allowed those buildings in the first place should look carefully at any future proposals by building companies. This also applies to other council, or, that for a change they listen to the public. There is a large office block built at Regent Centre in Gosforth still standing empty after several years but also has lights burning night and day yet empty. A complete waste of space and money and advised against by the public when first proposed.</p>	Development
793738	RESIDENT	LPCD932	No	<p>I don't feel it's necessary to be building more offices when so many presently stand unused (on what were previously fields)</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794219	RESIDENT	LPCD1311	No	<p>enough empty workplaces now</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794594	RESIDENT	LPCD1524	No	<p>We have plenty of empty office space already</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795013	RESIDENT	LPCD1555	No	<p>Redevelop existing run-down industrial sites, there are numerous empty factories and offices.</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
797386	RESIDENT	LPCD6102	No	<p>As with housing, I do not see any evidence that large areas will be needed. We are now an area of service industry, retail and small manufacturers, processors etc. What indicates that such large amounts of extra space as are proposed will be needed? For example, there is currently a considerable amount of unused office space in NT. It must be right that current industry and business is supported to remain profitable and to expand as appropriate and that we encourage additional businesses to come to this area; but it would be inappropriate materially to increase the proportion of employment space here.</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791057	RESIDENT	LPCD28	No	<p>None given.</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791197	RESIDENT	LPCD36	No	<p>No further comment</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
791307	RESIDENT	LPCD39	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
464030	RESIDENT	LPCD90	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791407	RESIDENT	LPCD130	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791875	RESIDENT	LPCD173	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
640418	RESIDENT	LPCD304	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791522	RESIDENT	LPCD260	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791883	RESIDENT	LPCD179	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791886	RESIDENT	LPCD186	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792105	RESIDENT	LPCD250	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
792446	RESIDENT	LPCD311	No	No comment	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792499	RESIDENT	LPCD318	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792502	RESIDENT	LPCD331	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792511	RESIDENT	LPCD336	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792513	RESIDENT	LPCD344	No	cdb	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
590145	RESIDENT	LPCD735	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792532	RESIDENT	LPCD379	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792542	RESIDENT	LPCD390	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792597	RESIDENT	LPCD410	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
792734	RESIDENT	LPCD461	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792841	RESIDENT	LPCD494	No	None given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792995	RESIDENT	LPCD557	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793005	RESIDENT	LPCD849	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793048	RESIDENT	LPCD665	No	No comment	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793138	RESIDENT	LPCD690	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793476	RESIDENT	LPCD794	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
461977	RESIDENT	LPCD1614	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
587868	RESIDENT	LPCD1326	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
641227	RESIDENT	LPCD1146	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793662	RESIDENT	LPCD892	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793668	RESIDENT	LPCD907	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793758	RESIDENT	LPCD957	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793893	RESIDENT	LPCD1090	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794027	RESIDENT	LPCD1176	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794048	RESIDENT	LPCD1185	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794139	RESIDENT	LPCD1264	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794158	RESIDENT	LPCD1282	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
794159	RESIDENT	LPCD1281	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794185	RESIDENT	LPCD1294	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794204	RESIDENT	LPCD1306	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794302	RESIDENT	LPCD1335	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794303	RESIDENT	LPCD1346	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794562	RESIDENT	LPCD1505	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794566	RESIDENT	LPCD1545	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794805	RESIDENT	LPCD1549	No	No to all	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795052	RESIDENT	LPCD1554	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
795056	RESIDENT	LPCD1560	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795123	RESIDENT	LPCD1571	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795160	RESIDENT	LPCD1584	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795294	RESIDENT	LPCD1611	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795303	RESIDENT	LPCD1615	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795327	RESIDENT	LPCD1738	No	None Given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795347	RESIDENT	LPCD1630	No	No response	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795566	RESIDENT	LPCD1704	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795623	RESIDENT	LPCD1720	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
795653	RESIDENT	LPCD1725	No	No Response.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
457989	RESIDENT	LPCD5067	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
466979	RESIDENT	LPCD5068	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
467684	RESIDENT	LPCD3568	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
468254	RESIDENT	LPCD4573	No	Look again at figures.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
470778	RESIDENT	LPCD3646	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
797173	RESIDENT	LPCD1757	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
797201	RESIDENT	LPCD1763	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
797328	RESIDENT	LPCD1790	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

## RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
797361	RESIDENT	LPCD1801	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
797382	RESIDENT	LPCD1824	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
797625	RESIDENT	LPCD1904	No	na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
798039	RESIDENT	LPCD2016	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
798282	RESIDENT	LPCD2057	No	No response	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
798574	RESIDENT	LPCD2084	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
798687	RESIDENT	LPCD2122	No	Hectare = 10,000 m2	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
800421	RESIDENT	LPCD2308	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
800453	RESIDENT	LPCD2335	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
800496	RESIDENT	LPCD2348	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
800789	RESIDENT	LPCD2370	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
801572	RESIDENT	LPCD2409	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
803466	RESIDENT	LPCD2455	No	No response	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
803472	RESIDENT	LPCD2459	No	No response.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
804944	RESIDENT	LPCD2934	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
804998	RESIDENT	LPCD2964	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805010	RESIDENT	LPCD2979	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805060	RESIDENT	LPCD3110	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
805078	RESIDENT	LPCD3166	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805083	RESIDENT	LPCD3188	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805242	RESIDENT	LPCD3294	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805252	RESIDENT	LPCD3312	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805343	RESIDENT	LPCD3479	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805381	RESIDENT	LPCD3587	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805396	RESIDENT	LPCD3611	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805404	RESIDENT	LPCD3642	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805428	RESIDENT	LPCD3654	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
807162	RESIDENT	LPCD4838	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807188	RESIDENT	LPCD4870	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807291	RESIDENT	LPCD4971	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807330	RESIDENT	LPCD4994	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807414	RESIDENT	LPCD5024	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807544	RESIDENT	LPCD5080	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807779	RESIDENT	LPCD5164	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807790	RESIDENT	LPCD5182	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807799	RESIDENT	LPCD5183	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
807825	RESIDENT	LPCD5209	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807835	RESIDENT	LPCD5217	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807900	RESIDENT	LPCD5246	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808003	RESIDENT	LPCD5344	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808018	RESIDENT	LPCD5343	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808091	RESIDENT	LPCD5420	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808139	RESIDENT	LPCD5495	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
469684	RESIDENT	LPCD5721	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
471031	RESIDENT	LPCD6172	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
594617	RESIDENT	LPCD5916	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808173	RESIDENT	LPCD5535	No	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808189	RESIDENT	LPCD5554	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808202	RESIDENT	LPCD5576	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808354	RESIDENT	LPCD5688	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808372	RESIDENT	LPCD5693	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808545	RESIDENT	LPCD5759	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808615	RESIDENT	LPCD5818	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808638	RESIDENT	LPCD5855	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
808714	RESIDENT	LPCD5906	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
809133	RESIDENT	LPCD6285	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
789782	RESIDENT	LPCD6	No	None given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
588587	RESIDENT	LPCD1128	No	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
591119	RESIDENT	LPCD5280	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
591698	RESIDENT	LPCD3118	No	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
804541	RESIDENT	LPCD5089	No	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
638474	RESIDENT	LPCD2033	Yes	If road network can cope	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793768	RESIDENT	LPCD970	Yes	But please ensure all current spaces are being used efficiently or designated for another purpose	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
396802	RESIDENT	LPCD776	Yes	But not at the cost of housing! oomuch land is lying empty, and too many empty office blocks. Priority should be given where it is needed most. Pointless developing sites for employment if no one is going to use site.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
800431	RESIDENT	LPCD2323	Yes	But using derelict land and Buildings.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2807	Yes	A minimum level of 170 hectares should be provided for future potential employment facilities. It is important that the proposed areas of employment land identified in the Plan are not permitted to become sites for housing development in later years. The riverside strip and A19 economic corridor have unique and valuable characteristics for industry and commerce that could not be replaced if lost to housing developments.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808699	RESIDENT	LPCD5901	Yes	Providing land/buildings that can be affordably purchased for business.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
675953	RESIDENT	LPCD1678	Yes	I strongly support your efforts to provide more in the way of employment since there are many people in existing residential properties who do not have jobs. Achieving the highest possible percentage of employment is an excellent thing to aim for.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791349	RESIDENT	LPCD88	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791356	RESIDENT	LPCD102	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791403	RESIDENT	LPCD124	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791889	RESIDENT	LPCD195	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
792075	RESIDENT	LPCD228	Yes	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
396848	RESIDENT	LPCD876	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
444595	RESIDENT	LPCD548	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
444604	RESIDENT	LPCD481	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
590690	RESIDENT	LPCD365	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792546	RESIDENT	LPCD387	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792938	RESIDENT	LPCD513	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792978	RESIDENT	LPCD539	Yes	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793038	RESIDENT	LPCD646	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
793078	RESIDENT	LPCD698	Yes	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793131	RESIDENT	LPCD683	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793412	RESIDENT	LPCD722	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793415	RESIDENT	LPCD726	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793437	RESIDENT	LPCD752	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793443	RESIDENT	LPCD758	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793488	RESIDENT	LPCD829	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793563	RESIDENT	LPCD847	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
396839	RESIDENT	LPCD1373	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
444526	RESIDENT	LPCD1358	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
458166	RESIDENT	LPCD1202	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
469404	RESIDENT	LPCD1105	Yes	Depending on where it is.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793663	RESIDENT	LPCD896	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793754	RESIDENT	LPCD949	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793796	RESIDENT	LPCD1012	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793817	RESIDENT	LPCD1046	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793822	RESIDENT	LPCD1051	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793926	RESIDENT	LPCD1107	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
794009	RESIDENT	LPCD1136	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794018	RESIDENT	LPCD1164	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794059	RESIDENT	LPCD1195	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794101	RESIDENT	LPCD1227	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794119	RESIDENT	LPCD1248	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794238	RESIDENT	LPCD1331	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794350	RESIDENT	LPCD1388	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794358	RESIDENT	LPCD1392	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
794569	RESIDENT	LPCD1508	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
794749	RESIDENT	LPCD1535	Yes	No response	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795098	RESIDENT	LPCD1566	Yes	No Response	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
795496	RESIDENT	LPCD1691	Yes	No response	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
796557	RESIDENT	LPCD1741	Yes	None given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
464488	RESIDENT	LPCD5475	Yes	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
466526	RESIDENT	LPCD2687	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
467711	RESIDENT	LPCD2270	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
469523	RESIDENT	LPCD2955	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
470045	RESIDENT	LPCD2175	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
471121	RESIDENT	LPCD5061	Yes	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
588147	RESIDENT	LPCD3319	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
797290	RESIDENT	LPCD1774	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
797322	RESIDENT	LPCD1780	Yes	None given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
797398	RESIDENT	LPCD1831	Yes	None given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
797412	RESIDENT	LPCD1837	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
798299	RESIDENT	LPCD2061	Yes	No response	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
798606	RESIDENT	LPCD2074	Yes	No response	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
798782	RESIDENT	LPCD2158	Yes	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
798995	RESIDENT	LPCD2198	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
800427	RESIDENT	LPCD2312	Yes	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
800519	RESIDENT	LPCD2360	Yes	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
800779	RESIDENT	LPCD2366	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
803337	RESIDENT	LPCD5440	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
803420	RESIDENT	LPCD2442	Yes	RW	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
803506	RESIDENT	LPCD2469	Yes	No response.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
803722	RESIDENT	LPCD2499	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
804918	RESIDENT	LPCD2924	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
804927	RESIDENT	LPCD2928	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805053	RESIDENT	LPCD3097	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805172	RESIDENT	LPCD3251	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805216	RESIDENT	LPCD3264	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805237	RESIDENT	LPCD3280	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805248	RESIDENT	LPCD3304	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805257	RESIDENT	LPCD3316	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805265	RESIDENT	LPCD3333	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
805268	RESIDENT	LPCD3341	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
807156	RESIDENT	LPCD4831	Yes	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807446	RESIDENT	LPCD5057	Yes	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807743	RESIDENT	LPCD5101	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807810	RESIDENT	LPCD5189	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807842	RESIDENT	LPCD5221	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808047	RESIDENT	LPCD5376	Yes	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
589055	RESIDENT	LPCD5985	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808201	RESIDENT	LPCD5573	Yes	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808309	RESIDENT	LPCD5674	Yes	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
808570	RESIDENT	LPCD5771	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808597	RESIDENT	LPCD5798	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808629	RESIDENT	LPCD5828	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808662	RESIDENT	LPCD5885	Yes	Na	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808797	RESIDENT	LPCD5946	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
809117	RESIDENT	LPCD6251	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
809130	RESIDENT	LPCD6268	Yes	n/a	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
451166	RESIDENT	LPCD244	Yes	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
631932	RESIDENT	LPCD280	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
793117	RESIDENT	LPCD2333	Yes	NA	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808294	RESIDENT	LPCD5640	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
792975	RESIDENT	LPCD529	0	Developing land for employment? Can't comment, I have no idea what kind of employment it would mean. That would be a factor in deciding where it would be put e.g. pollution of air and noise, build up of traffic near built up areas etc.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
797142	RESIDENT	LPCD1750	0	Depends - what type of business? Could some other areas not be re-developed? Is this not something that can be looked at with neighbouring councils also?	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
464454	RESIDENT	LPCD2665	0	Unable to answer as no idea what 170acres is.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808006	RESIDENT	LPCD5339	0	As for business premises there are a massive number of empty premises in the county eg Cobalt. These should be developed first before building on green field sites.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
791316	RESIDENT	LPCD80	0	I am concerned about the unused space at Cobalt Business Park. Why build more business areas when these are not filled?	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807432	RESIDENT	LPCD5050	0	There appears to be quite a bit of unused "office space"™ in the Borough " Silverlink/Cobalt/Quoram " do we need more?	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
793868	RESIDENT	LPCD1079	0	Surrounded now by employment opportunities - Cobalt (lots of empty buildings)	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
792059	RESIDENT	LPCD213	0	What type of employment? Manufacturing or services or a mix?	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
467876	RESIDENT	LPCD4841	0	Unable to answer as no idea what 170acres is	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
472956	RESIDENT	LPCD2651	0	Unable to answer as no idea what 170 acres is	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
798761	RESIDENT	LPCD2152	0		S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
798761	RESIDENT	LPCD3450	0	The other pink striped areas are, I presume largely “Brownfield” areas “ suitable for mixed development to improve the quality of life.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807169	RESIDENT	LPCD4846	0	How big is 170 hectares? Give us an example	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807899	RESIDENT	LPCD5241	0	I don't know.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
808138	RESIDENT	LPCD5481	0	Can't visualise 170 hectares	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
458324	RESIDENT	LPCD2137	0	Don't know	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development
590531	RESIDENT	LPCD2217	0	Need example of 170 hectare, cannot judge	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
594633	RESIDENT	LPCD2106	0		S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
444595	RESIDENT	LPCD641	0	General principle - if industrial zones are not working, redesignate and build houses	DM/5.3 : Development Affecting Employment Land and Buildings
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3350	In part	I am more in favour of converting unused office blocks in the whole of the north east to residential. If you say we have a housing shortage.	DM/5.3 : Development Affecting Employment Land and Buildings
590131	RESIDENT	LPCD1101	0	More effort should be made to utilise the empty factory units and large shops/buildings some of which have been empty for 15+ years. Perhaps the Council could publish a map showing how many empty industrial units etc. there are	DM/5.3 : Development Affecting Employment Land and Buildings
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2742	In part		DM/5.3 : Development Affecting Employment Land and Buildings
807446	RESIDENT	LPCD5053	0	No invasive industries near new homes e.g. smoke, noise, smells, pollutants	DM/5.3 : Development



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Affecting Employment Land and Buildings
594617	RESIDENT	LPCD5942	In part	Redevelop run down areas/trading estates	DM/5.3 : Development Affecting Employment Land and Buildings
807446	RESIDENT	LPCD5054	0	No invasive industries near new homes e.g. smoke, noise, smells, pollutants	DM/5.4 Employment Land Development Outside Identified or Existing Employment Land
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2743	0	Making sure there are "corner shop" and community centres built into all new housing development will provide employment.	DM/5.4 Employment Land Development Outside Identified or Existing Employment Land
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2808	Yes	It is important that the proposed employment sites on the North Bank are reserved for industries and commercial developments that require river access and deep water berths etc. The North Bank provides unique facilities for industry. It may take several years to attract the required industry but it is important that we do not lose these valuable sites to other developments. Other areas in the Borough can provide space for normal commercial developments.	AS/5.5 River Tyne North Bank

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2744	Yes		AS/5.5 River Tyne North Bank
808139	RESIDENT	LPCD5493	0	River front should be allocated for employment - Majority of area is brownfield site	AS/5.5 River Tyne North Bank
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	LPCD6202	0	The Agency acknowledges the intentions to focus new employment development at the A19(T) economic corridor and as stated in response to Policy S/5.1, this strategy has the potential to significantly impact on the operation and safety of the SRN. Whilst the Agency is supportive of Parts a. and b. and the intentions to improve public transport infrastructure and access, and the focus on providing office development within close proximity to the metro stations, until a decision has been made on the final site allocations and the quantum of development to be proposed across the A19(T) corridor, the potential implications for the SRN cannot robustly assessed. Therefore, the Agency is not currently in a position to determine whether the network is fully capable of supporting the economic strategy along this corridor or whether further improvements may be required to mitigate its impact, in addition to what has already been proposed in the Plan and supporting IDP. In accordance with DfT Circular 02/2013, The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development, where future strategic growth will have implications for the SRN, the Agency will require any capacity enhancements or infrastructure required to deliver this growth to be identified within the Local Plan. This should help to provide greater certainty and viability to the delivery of the Plans proposals and to the delivery of the infrastructure improvements required to support and deliver the strategy.	AS/5.6 A19(T) Economic Corridor
546048	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	LPCD5214	No	We have noted that the Corridor extends to the east of the A19(T) and along the north bank of the River Tyne up to the Port's land holdings at the Ferry Terminal. The policy, therefore, includes the Port's Howdon Yard which is intended for refurbishment in the short term for port related activities, possibly bulk cargoes. It also includes existing land and premises to the east of the Yard let to the Port's tenants, including Velva Liquids (Simon Storage) and Northumbrian Water. Given the policies emphasis on office development we would question the inclusion of this land within the corridor. As suggested above we request that policy S/5.1 is expanded to support a range of employment and business uses in this area and that the land is excluded from this policy. This would then allow policy AS/5.6 to focus on office related development only, if this is still what is desired by the authority.	AS/5.6 A19(T) Economic Corridor
587121	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	LPCD2422	0	Policy AS 5.6 proposes best practice by prioritising office-type use within 500 metres of Metro stations. There are similar statements about prioritising Metro and public transport accessibility, for example in policy DM 6.10, but we would like to see a similar explicit corridor/distance prioritisation within other policies in the Local Plan, so as to directly encourage increased catchments for public transport.	AS/5.6 A19(T) Economic Corridor

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2738	No	There needs to be a green definition of sustainable economic growth.	DM/5.7 : Employment and Skills
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2740	In part	add "sustainable green" before the word growth in intro. Rest, not to bad.	DM/5.7 : Employment and Skills
789782	RESIDENT	LPCD18	0	I propose the Council looks to developing Whitley Bay along the lines of Tynemouth. WB is a poor man's version of Tynemouth: the Council needs to provide same "up market developments" e.g. another tourist info outdoor eating wine bars boutiques signs and museum areas Restor WB to be a happy beach resort all year round. Building on its Victorian heritage e.g. like Brighton, Tynemouth, Bournemouth, Weston S. mare, etc.	5 Tourism at the Coast
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3351	0	Campsites & a back packers hostel is lacking in the area.	5 Tourism at the Coast
805522	RESIDENT	LPCD3805	0	RE: Long Sands Pool - continuing coucil commitment for developmet of the pool.	5 Tourism at the Coast
444595	RESIDENT	LPCD642	0	Refurbish Tynemouth Outdoor Pool for swimming. Have more campsites for tents	AS/5.8 Tourism at the Coast
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4941	In part	More modern hotels are needed to support a tourism startegy and older hotels could be coverted or replaced with housing!	AS/5.8 Tourism at the Coast
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2810	Yes	Significant tourist accommodation is being created in Newcastle. The Plan should therefore also be proposing ways of exploiting day visitors from Newcastle and cruise ship visitors etc. This will be achieved by ensuring the coastal area is maintained and developed to meet and exceed the expectations of such day visitors. It is important that we stop using the existing tourist accommodation at the coast as temporary social housing - this discourages normal visitors to the area.	AS/5.8 Tourism at the Coast
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2736	Yes	But should be liinks across the borough	AS/5.8 Tourism at the Coast
805402	RESIDENT	LPCD3732	Yes	1. There are a number of derelict commercial properties along the sea front at Whitley Bay that are in desperate need of bring back into use or redeveloping. These include the High Point Hotel (has been empty for 20+ years?), The Avenue Pub and several others. 2. The Promenade along Whitley Bay sea front is in a deplorable state and it is important that this area is brought back into a state of good repair, fit to attract visitors. The promenade tarmacked and flagged surfaces are breaking up and the low wall and steps down onto the beach are also in a very poor state. The promenade hand rails and posts are universally rotting away, some are already snapped off at their bases (this includes the	AS/5.8 Tourism at the Coast

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				handrails and post on the St Mary's Island section of promenade). The three shelters along the promenade are also in a very poor state and in urgent need of refurbishing.	
805402	RESIDENT	LPCD3821	In part	On no account must there be any development on the Links between St Mary's Island and the Spanish City at Whitley Bay. In particular the mini golf course building should not be developed beyond that as a small café being open only until the early evening. The area around this building is a vital part of a wild life corridor and is frequented by feeding and roosting birds and their disturbance should be avoided.	AS/5.8 Tourism at the Coast
805522	RESIDENT	LPCD3807	Yes		AS/5.8 Tourism at the Coast
807887	RESIDENT	LPCD5228	0	We have lived in Whitley Bay area all our lives over 70years. The Council are making too many mistakes, if they want people to visit, car parks should not be built on such as Bournemouth Gardens. The Avenue and Highpoint hotel are a disgrace.	AS/5.8 Tourism at the Coast
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4943	Yes	An additional Metro station could be provided adjacent to the Park Hotel and aquarium without excessive encroachment on Beaconsfield open space.	AS/5.9 Longsands: Temporary Events Area
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2811	Yes	The Longsands provides an amazing asset for North Tyneside. Beaconsfield provides an under used, large open area facility. It should be marketed for events such as displays, concerts and circus but not for overnight camping and caravans. Provision should be made for a possible small Metro station to be constructed adjacent to Beaconsfield at some time in the future if popular use of the site can be achieved. A Metro station would also provide easier access by public transport to the Longsands and the Sea-life Aquarium. Active support should also be given to the repair and development of the old open-air Tynemouth swimming pool and it's adjacent land. Support should also be provided for developing the toilet block into a beach cafe located at the north end of the Longsands.	AS/5.9 Longsands: Temporary Events Area
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2737	Yes		AS/5.9 Longsands: Temporary Events Area
805522	RESIDENT	LPCD3808	Yes		AS/5.9 Longsands: Temporary Events Area

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
396253	DEVELOPER	LPCD2681	0	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 Town Centres and Retail Provision
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	LPCD6143	Yes	Policy S/6.1 " I welcome support for schemes which capitalise on the character, distinctiveness and heritage value of the Borough's town centres.	S/6.1 : Competitive Town Centres and Retail Provision
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	LPCD6207	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the policy and its encouragement given to maintaining the vitality of town centres (as opposed to unsustainable out of centre locations) which are easily accessible by public transport, walking and cycling. Providing a mix of uses and a range of facilities and services should help to encourage linked trips and reduce the number and distance of journeys required. As such the Agency is particularly supportive of Part f.	S/6.1 : Competitive Town Centres and Retail Provision
806149	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	LPCD4300	In part	On behalf of our client NewRiver Retail (GP3) and NewRiver Retail (Nominee No.3) Ltd (NRR) owners of the Forum Shopping Centre, Wallsend and the Beacon Centre, North Shields, we hereby submit the following representations on the North Tyneside Local Plan, Consultation Draft November 2013. As owners of two shopping centres in the North Tyneside's main town centres, NRR is a major investor in North Tyneside. NRR support the overall direction of the Plan, and is encouraged by the Council's continued support of town centres as the focus for retail and leisure activities and in particular, the commitment of the Council to the regeneration on Wallsend Town Centre and North Shields Town Centre. NRR is concerned that the retail policies as currently written do not sufficiently protect planned growth in centres against development which comes forward on edge of centre and out of centre sites. In particular, the Council's retail policy on out of centre development needs to be strengthened. Conversely, NRR also consider 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. NRR is generally supportive of the policies for retail and town centres as set out Chapter 6 of the Local Plan. NRR is encouraged by the Council's priorities for growth and investment as set out in Policy S/6.1 (Competitive Town Centres and Retail Development) and supports town centre redevelopment which would support the improvement in the range and quality of shops, services and facilities. NRR support 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. On behalf	S/6.1 : Competitive Town Centres and Retail Provision

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				of our client, NRR, we request to be kept informed about the progress with the North Tyneside Local Plan and wish to reserve our client’s position to make further representations on subsequent LDF documents. We trust that these comments are helpful. Please contact me if you require more information regarding these matters.	
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	LPCD6534	In part	Under Policy #DM/6: 1, Retail, we welcome the commitment to concentrating retail development in the town centres. We strongly urge that out of town or edge of town shopping centre developments should be rejected unless the strongest possible case can be made out for them. However, the proposals relating to sustainable transport are weak and we question whether, in Policy #S6/l, it is appropriate that the car should be the first transport mode mentioned.	S/6.1 : Competitive Town Centres and Retail Provision
396253	DEVELOPER	LPCD2682	0	It is acknowledged that the Retail and Leisure Study (2011) provides a helpful indication as to the amount of additional floorspace required over the plan period. However The Northumberland Estates request that Policy S/6.2 be modified to make clear that, while the 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 the retail impact assessment at the point of planning application submission and that there may be scope (eg through clawback of expenditure leakage or growth in expenditure over time) to support additional floorspace over and above that currently identified. It is important that the Plan does not impose artificial limits on the quantum of convenience and comparison floorspace which can come forward in the Borough, particularly as requirements are likely to change over the course of the plan period. We also note that paragraph 6.11 of the Consultation Draft states that, on the basis of the Retail and Leisure Study’s findings, there is no demand for further major leisure developments at present. 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 plan to provide new leisure facilities which meet the needs granted by this growth spending. This is particularly the case given the new and emerging leisure schemes coming forward in nearby local authority areas, including Newcastle City Centre, Gateshead Town Centre and Cramlington, and at the MetroCentre – which are likely to attract customers from North Tyneside and contribute towards unsustainable travel patterns. It is considered that the site to the west of Northumberland Park District Centre offers significant 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.	S/6.2 Future Retail Demand
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	LPCD6209	0	The Agency has no particularly comment to make in relation to the quantum of retail floorspace identified in the policy other than it should prioritise town centres first in accordance with the hierarchy identified in Policy S/6.3. The Borough’s town centres generally provide the best access	S/6.2 Future Retail Demand

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				from public transport, walking and cycling and therefore generally present the most sustainable locations for delivering future retail development.	
805376	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	LPCD3566	0	Our client notes the estimates of future convenience and comparison retail floorspace in the Borough detailed in Policy S/6.2 and welcomes the acknowledgement that additional retail floorspace is required in the Borough over the Plan period to meet future demands. We would question however whether such a simple quantitative assessment of future needs is a robust basis on which to plan for future needs, and whether such an approach accords with guidance in NPPF. As the Council will be aware that NPPF only requires proposals for new out of centre retail proposals to be refused where they result in a "significant adverse impact" on the vitality and viability of any town centre(s), or where there are sequentially preferable sites available that could accommodate the proposed development. The Plan does not appear to have undertaken any such assessment of potential sites and the quantitative need for any retail proposal is only one factor in assessing "impact". We would also point out that such floorspace figures quickly become out of date and as the Plan acknowledges are not very reliable especially in the longer term It is entirely possible therefore that proposals for retail development may come forward over the plan period that exceed the floorspace figures listed in Policy S/6.2 and would still be acceptable. Individual proposal for out of centre retail development therefore need to be assessed on their own individual merits at the time that planning permission is sought. We would suggest that Policy S/6.2 is deleted and figures relating to quantitative need are incorporated into the supporting text.	S/6.2 Future Retail Demand
396421	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	LPCD4425	0	Signet Planning are instructed on behalf of Station Developments Limited in respect of Tynemouth Station and wish to response to the Local Plan Consultation Draft. By way of context, Station Developments Limited secured planning permission and listed building consent via appeal on 4 February 2011 for development of the eastern concourse area (Appeal reference: APP/W4515/A/10/2133781). The proposed development is the restoration of listed canopy structure and use of part of the Appeal Site for an arts, cultural and market programme, construction of a retail unit and associated car parking and altered vehicular access, station manager's office with associated storage, public library with heritage centre, photographic society, community meeting rooms associated car parking and new vehicular access, public toilets and landscaping. Market conditions have been particularly difficult and the permission has not been implemented due to the prevailing economic conditions although discussions / negotiations are on-going with a number of food retailers regarding the retail element of the scheme. One of the main issues to be debated during the public enquiry was retail impact. The Inspector concluded: 1. There is no persuasive evidence to suggest that the proposal would significantly harm investment in North Shields or any other centre; 2. The effect of the proposal on the vitality and viability of Tynemouth would be positive. Tynemouth is quite a large local centre with some of the features of a district centre. It is poorly served with convenience retail facilities ... The proposed retail unit would provide very good facilities, well related to the centre,	S/6.2 Future Retail Demand

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>especially for Metro users ... but also to the general population of Tynemouth; 3. The impact of the proposals on in-centre trade and on trade in the wider area would not be significantly harmful; 4. The proposed development would be of an appropriate scale in relation to the size of the centre and its role in the hierarchy of centres; 5. There is no material harm to local centres; The impact on Tynemouth's economic and physical regeneration would be positive, enhancing economic activity and leading to the regeneration of an important listed building in the conservation area; 7. Local employment would increase in Tynemouth through jobs generated during construction and the employment created at the complete retail unit; 8. Overall, the effect of the retail element of the proposals would be acceptable. The acceptability of the convenience retail element of the appeal scheme was debated and confirmed by the Inspector. Since that time, there have been no material changes and retail use on the Tynemouth Station site remains acceptable. On that basis, the council can and should allocate part of the Tynemouth Station site, approved for retail use by the appeal decision, for convenience retail provision for Tynemouth. In addition, whilst the 'pod' type units on the western concourse of the station were not included with the appeal application, the units have been marketed for a range of uses including Use Classes A1 , A2, A3, D1 and D2 for last couple of years following the council's vacation of the units. However, interest has been limited until more recently and again discussions are now on-going with a number of parties regarding potential uses. The units are fit for use and a range of uses would be acceptable, given the site is within the defined district centre boundary. As such, the units can and should be allocated in the Local Plan for the range of uses listed above which are predominantly town centre uses. This will assist in bringing the units back into viable economic use.</p>	
0	RESIDENT	0	0	third line " proposals" should be " proposed".	S/6.3 : Hierarchy of Centres
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2746	Yes		S/6.3 : Hierarchy of Centres 0
444595	RESIDENT	LPCD643	In part	Allow conversions of shops to housing in town centres	DM/6.4 : Town and District Centre Development
794350	RESIDENT	LPCD1390	No	Build suburbs where there is demand but stop suburbanising the town centres	DM/6.4 : Town and District Centre



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
					Development
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4945	Yes	Support b in particular for low cost rented accomodation or as use of offices above ground floor retail units.	DM/6.4 : Town and District Centre Development
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2747	Yes		DM/6.4 : Town and District Centre Development
805832	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	LPCD4169	In part	To aid the footfall in the town centre, the links to the Fish Quay should be highlighted and developed. The ferry landing should be moved to West Quay to engage more directly with the No. 1 Town Centre in S/6.3 Hierarchy of Centres	AS/6.5 North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre
806149	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	LPCD4303	Yes	The Beacon Centre was first built in 1978 with phase two opening some ten years later. It comprises of 42 retail units include Boots, Wilkinson's and New Look. The Beacon Centre has a multi-storey car park adjacent, with spaces for 423 cars. NRR is working with the Council to investigate the potential refurbishment of the Beacon Centre and improve the active frontages to the town centre. NRR is generally supportive of the policy text for AS/6.5 (North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre, as this is broadly in line with the ambitions to refurbish the shopping centre and improve the active frontages into the town centre.	AS/6.5 North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3354	Yes	I agree only if your definition of a sustainable evening economy includes mainly cultural and sporting activities and family friendly activities. You needn't worry about undermining the overall attraction to Whitley Bay as there is no attraction at the moment for anyone except those who want to get hammered drunk on a weekend.	AS/6.6 Coastal Evening Economy: Whitley Bay and Tynemouth
800362	RESIDENT	LPCD2280	Yes	Whitley Bay should be prioritised above Tynemouth. Tynemouth has been regenerated successfully and represents a much smaller population. The South Parade area should be prioritised towards up market bars, restaurants and cafes, suitable for both families, young people and older people. The stag and hen party culture needs to be swept out of the town centre and focus should be placed on encouraging families back into the town centre. The coastal stretch at Whitley Bay should also be prioritised. The council have allowed this area to become an eye sore and it is quite frankly a disgrace. The council need to develop a much greater commercial view of development, investing funds around the Dome area, and along the sea front to encourage local businesses to set up new ventures. I do not	AS/6.6 Coastal Evening Economy: Whitley Bay and Tynemouth

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				want to see this area redeveloped into housing and old peoples homes, which is the easy option. It needs to be thought about carefully and we need to avoid selling off the land to make a quick profit.	
797386	RESIDENT	LPCD6110	In part	Whitley Bay. I am sure I am not alone in welcoming the positive approach of the Council towards the regeneration of the Spanish City, former Avenue pub and surrounding areas. But this needs to happen without delay. Whitley Bay is no longer the preferred destination for stage nights etc. This has meant that those streets are now not busy at all with business of any kind. Unless those pubs and clubs are to be converted to housing (a recent development near there has not sold) a new type of business needs to grow up there and the Spanish City development may provide the catalyst for this. I would like to see further detail of how the Council thinks that this part of Whitley Bay might develop; for example, if it is thought that it might become the retirement centre of the north east, there should be further specific consultation.	AS/6.6 Coastal Evening Economy: Whitley Bay and Tynemouth
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2812	Yes	The plan needs to recognise that the night-life economy associated with South Parade Whitley Bay has substantially changed over the last few years. We should not be attempting to return the area to the stag night, hen party type trade. The leisure and commercial facilities in this part of Whitley Bay should now be encouraged to move towards family, day visitor, couples and high value products that will support the local economy both at night and during the day. This will require a long term strategic marketing approach. Restaurants, galleries, cafes and specialist shops need to be established. Some properties in the area will need to be returned to high value accommodation units.	AS/6.6 Coastal Evening Economy: Whitley Bay and Tynemouth
805386	RESIDENT	LPCD3639	Yes	There is no mention in the plan for removing the derelict Avenue public house. This is an eyesore and is central to the regeneration of the coastal area and the town centre. A more diverse type of evening entertainment and venues would bring in new visitors. This is critical to the regeneration of the coastal area.	AS/6.6 Coastal Evening Economy: Whitley Bay and Tynemouth
800431	RESIDENT	LPCD2330	In part	Wallsend Shops in Forum and High Street need to be used as people have to travel out of the area.	AS/6.7 The Forum Shopping Centre, Wallsend
805564	RESIDENT	LPCD3940	Yes	Wallsend Forum and the High Street used to be thriving shopping centres and have been sadly neglected over the years. It's not all about retail and we now have some good quality restaurants in Wallsend. In order to support regeneration in terms of both retail and recreation/leisure, car parking will play a vital role not just within the Forum but also along the High Street	AS/6.7 The Forum Shopping Centre, Wallsend

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD1748	In part	I am pleased to see that you are including a provision for leisure activities in this area. As this was the site of the Wallsend Theatre Royal I would like to see a commitment to build and "afordable to hiires" performance space. Sometnt group hiring in the nature of a 120 seat theatre with back stage facilities and rehersal space along with a social area, and possibly run by a local community management system would improve the social scene in Wallsend no end. Any housing that is built in this area should be to the highest ecological standards and then be available to bye or rent at a suitable rate that ordinary young people of Wallsend can afford.	AS/6.8 Portugal Place and High Street West, Wallsend
0	RESIDENT	0	0	The Shiremoor District centre expansion is dangerous. It's Policy ,at 6.9 (c) appears to be at odds with the earlier text reference to " passing trade" .Not sure either about traffic impact on the A19(T) if comparison retail is expanded at this location. Previous proposals , we're not " local" in nature.	AS/6.9 Northumberland Park District Centre Retail Development
0	RESIDENT	0	0	DM 6.10 (a) just does not make sense. Paras 6.61-6.63 should be in a policy and not supporting text.	DM/6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development
791349	RESIDENT	LPCD96	In part	As an elderly disabled woman of 88 I can still use my very near local shops. With an imcreasing elderly population I do not agree with more out-of-town large retail outlets. I deplore the gradual death of high streets, many empty shops could be used for drop-in centres and cafes and increase rates etc.	DM/6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3355	No	There are enough out-of-town centres. don't build any more. develop the retail potential of the town centres.	DM/6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development
471121	RESIDENT	LPCD5062	0	All existing employment sites must be ring fenced along with new site earmarked for employment purposes Jobs must be found through investment in employment sites for people already resident in the Borough before another large influx of outsiders come into purchase house and travel outside Borough for employment thus causing more traffic congestion which is already a serious problem. No more large out of town retail centres, night time economy huge investment to remain sustainable	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
791886	RESIDENT	LPCD193	0	SHIREMOOR - far too many takeaways in a small area. We do not agree with your plans. This area is over-run with takeaways, causing traffic/parking problems, parking on pavements, rubbish, vermin, and late night noise etc. Think you shuld make Shiremoor just a giant car-park and rubbish dumping	DM/6.11 Local Facilities

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				area, those who live here are sick of it. The overdevelopment and far too many fod outlets. It is affecting house prices.	
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2748	Yes	Best proposal in the report!	DM/6.11 Local Facilities
792484	0	LPCD315	0	I would like to see the council making some use of the collection of white elephant structures sitting on the Cobalt, and converting these perpetually empty buildings into housing / apartments for local residents. Surely that will be more use than waiting in vain for the 'entrepreneurs' to show up????	7 Housing
792841	RESIDENT	LPCD503	0	Following a long career in local government housing i know what works: 1.Abolish forever the right to buy 2.Raise funds at very low % for 30/60 years borrowers and build council (not housing association or private) housing to rent at controlled rents “ show leadership “ this can actually make a profit for the council. 3.Manage the housing stock to match need to accommodation. Ensure no sublets / false tenancies etc.	7 Housing
638780	0	LPCD2251	0	It appears so far that any housing that has been going up in Whitley Bay has been far in excess of affordable for first time buyers. It is time that housing for first time buyers is considered first and foremost rather than building housing for the rich!!!	7 Housing
794086	0	LPCD1226	0	Affordable housing is required particularly for young people and those on low incomes. This is particularly urgent in the coastal areas where housing from Whitley Bay down to Tynemouth is out of financial reach for many people. Without affordable housing, these areas will just become the preserve of the wealthy and this will create a divided and two-tier community. I urge North Tyneside Council to provide more social housing for people in or near these areas to ensure that a good social mix of people develops.	7 Housing
797110	0	LPCD2751	0	It is important to not only to consider what is built but how it is built. There is little point in producing a cheep energy guzerling house. All housing should be built to the highest possible ecological standards.	7 Housing
798282	RESIDENT	LPCD2058	0	Any site which is not current open space, i.e bounded by all sides by existing development, no retail larger than 6 FTE staff is required in new build.	7 Housing
463341	0	LPCD3525	0	Homes - Yes it would give new homes	7 Housing
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3356	0	Social or Council houses in preference to "Affordeable" houses should be built. With the council as the Landlord. But first use the empty properties in the borough before building anything.	7 Housing
804850	0	LPCD2782	0	Affordable housing must be the priority for any development, too many houses are being built with prices out of reach of working people. This must be constructed away from land between Murton and Monkseaton. Any development must be around the A19/A189 corridors which can have accesses added.	7 Housing
805275	0	LPCD3357	0	I live in the Monkseaton area and my home was flooded in 2011. NTC have made a promise to the	7 Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				residents of this area to build a dry reservoir on the land between Shiremoor and Monkseaton. According to NTC this will prevent future flooding in my area of Monkseaton. I am extremely alarmed to read NTC's planning document that proposes that this land between Shiremoor and Monkseaton has been earmarked for future housing. Building houses on this flood plain will surely lead to the flooding of these new homes and the repeated flooding to the homes in my area of Monkseaton.	
805490	0	LPCD3797	0	Many derlict factories ,offices warehouses retail and buisness units across N.Tyneside and all Tyne and wear area to reuse .Brownfield sites to be used only as ample supply of them.Developers want easy option of our greenfield sites ! say no to this and preserve and enhance our existing natural environment for future generations.	7 Housing
805907	0	LPCD4209	0	I object most strongly to the plans for a massive housing development in North Tyneside's One Core Strategy, which appear to have been formulated without any proper consultation with other councils.	7 Housing
810335	RESIDENT	LPCD6710	0	There are far too many houses being built in North Tyneside – not, I believe, all for current residents or their children and grandchildren as the council have stated but to enable more and more people to move into the area. I strongly object to the amount of new housing development taking place, which puts tremendous additional pressure on our services and roads. Largely, 3 and 4 bedroom and even bigger houses are being built, which on average means a further 2 cars per property on our roads. It’s interesting that the Council asks residents to pick preferred sites, (mainly green field) for development. In my opinion, the real question should have been if we wanted further development on our remaining open spaces at all. My answer would have been and still is- a resounding no! Government has requested housing to be increased year on year to help the local communities cope with the increase in population. I would have thought that North Tyneside has already surpassed their quota - over and above local requirements. I understand that developers are encouraged by Government to press for building sites – but in NT mostly green field sites are being systematically targeted. Developers can apply lots of pressure, but I hope the Council retains enough legal expertise to challenge these applications and have the courage to say no to the onslaught of new housing in this small borough.	7 Housing
792597	RESIDENT	LPCD459	0	Not to develop west of Monkseaton joining up with Shiremoor. This would destroy the beautiful open area which North Tyneside should preserve. Similarly for land wes of Backworth towards Killingworth. Furthermore developing these areas would have a massive impact on police resources which area already stretched within North Tyneside. I would prefer to see more development on brown or previous industrial sites which the borough has. We do not want more employment zones developed with office blocks that stand empty over on the Cobalt area.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
793005	RESIDENT	LPCD873	In part	Should always look at redeveloping existing / brownfield sites.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
793893	RESIDENT	LPCD1100	No	Building new homes doesn't help the housing market chain. There are loads of hoses up for sale which	S/7.1 Strategic

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				aren't moving.	Housing
797173	RESIDENT	LPCD1761	0	There is a wide range and number of empty houses, maybe the council should referb/regenerate these houses before building any more to make these suitable!!	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
799503	RESIDENT	LPCD2229	0	Having looked at your summary document I believe you should bias your plan entirely away from agricultural land and concentrate all your efforts towards re use of brown field sites. This area has little enough left of former agricultural land but a plethora of former industrial areas.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
469329	RESIDENT	LPCD2617	In part	There are currently so many new houses already planned on greenfield sites including the 200 houses in West Monkseaton and all the developments around Backworth and Shiremoor that I feel no more greenfield sites should be built on now until all the brown field sites have been 100% exhausted. There are so many industrial areas and boarded up buildings in the region which are sitting unused and bring the area down so I would like to see these redeveloped first before any other areas are even considered. More sensible sized housing such as one and two bedroom properties to get people on the property ladder would be preferable to more huge 4 and 5 bed houses.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
800789	RESIDENT	LPCD2384	0	Trying to develop small areas of land in existing conurbations increases traffic, risks of accidents, risk of flooding and generally decreases the standard of living of existing residents.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
805780	RESIDENT	LPCD4109	No	The average size of a 3 bedroom house in the UK is approximately 85 square metres (page 7 <a href="http://www.architecture.com/Files/RIBAHoldings/PolicyAndInternationalRelations/HomeWise/CaseforSpace.pdf">http://www.architecture.com/Files/RIBAHoldings/PolicyAndInternationalRelations/HomeWise/CaseforSpace.pdf</a> ) In the Vacant Property Schedule December 2013 ( <a href="http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/pls/portal/NTC_PSCM.PSCM_Web.download?p_ID=541298">http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/pls/portal/NTC_PSCM.PSCM_Web.download?p_ID=541298</a> ) North Tyneside Council had over 8,500 square metres of empty properties. Instead of building on land used for recreation why not redevelop some of these areas into small villages with units available to be used as local shops?	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
806212	RESIDENT	LPCD4343	0	Whilst my main concern is to protect wildlife routes in and out of the reserve, I would also encourage less building, more environmentally acceptable housing, use of Brownfield sites, and protecting Green areas peripheral to housing areas. That is how to deliver decent housing for the 21st century.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
806991	RESIDENT	LPCD4701	0	Although I am not a resident of N Tyneside, I can walk into it in less than 4 minutes, and walk onwards into open air and long views. While I understand the need to build more housing, there are many brownfield sites which have yet to be redeveloped in a positive way. Would it not be better to raise standards of sustainable building and living, rather than apparently giving in to the interests of large housing developers?	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
807446	RESIDENT	LPCD5052	0	There should be some policy that new homes are for established local residents "only"	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
807951	RESIDENT	LPCD5324	0	Avoid housing "deserts" - ie, not too far for residents to travel for shops, schools, GPs, libraries ect.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
808629	RESIDENT	LPCD5874	In part	High density residential development on all small sites to accommodate affordable housing needs and allocation	S/7.1 Strategic Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
808652	RESIDENT	LPCD5896	0	I do not want the costal/Monkseaton/Murton/North Farm ect to become another large estate which could take over the whole green areas available for pleasure for the whole community.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
808714	RESIDENT	LPCD5908	No	I donâ€™t believe that any of these sites should be developed for housing. Predicted requirements are ~notional~ Loss of open spaces Increase in traffic/congestion Facilities and infrastructure will not cope	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
808797	RESIDENT	LPCD5971	In part	All other smaller sites could be infilled with housing, catering for affordable element in flatted developments	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
805265	RESIDENT	LPCD6131	0	Prefer to see all the small infill sites developed.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
808835	RESIDENT	LPCD5977	No	Would it not be cheaper to convert old buildings or build on empty sites - Stephenson St, North Shields seems to be a prime spot. Obviously this would help to make local towns busier - handy for shops, trains and buses. Also because people wouldn't need to use cars so much it could ease traffic problems	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
808938	RESIDENT	LPCD6063	0	We note that certain of the residential sites are designated as having small scale retail use. We would question the economic viability of such a designation in these locations due to the proximity to major retail developments.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
809085	RESIDENT	LPCD6152	0	I object to the current plans. These proposals are disingenuous, destructive and threaten to bring about a huge increase in urban sprawl. Planning for sprawl is now widely seen as an urban disaster (see US) and leads to a big increase in travel journeys and therefore more congestion and worse air pollution. Furthermore the plan fails to work with other local authorities to link up proposals, as well as rides roughshod over landuse planning principles, sustainability and planning for the future. Remaining green space in the area, so vital to urban living, would be decimated. Most of the undeveloped sites that survive south of the greenbelt are scheduled for development. This includes several sites close to Gosforth Nature Reserve. It is a truly terrible idea. Please come into the 21st Century. Yes, this may mean questioning government's housing targets too.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
798830	0	LPCD2169	No	Affordable should be just that. to build three, four and five bedroom homes is not creating affordable housing. This should be two and three bedroom starter homes. Anyway, now that the scheme which was put in place by the government has been reduced, it might well not be a viable prospect, unless you build on a rent to buy basis. Across the dual carriageway from where i live a new estate is being created that does not represent affordable housing, but does represent a steady and continuous erosion of greenfield sites.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
804906	0	LPCD3411	Yes	Meeting housing need both now and in the future should be the number one priority even if this means having to build on all of the safeguarded land within the borough and some (but not all) of the green belt. I would rather this than small pockets of much-needed green open space in densely built-up areas being built on.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
805510	0	LPCD3771	No	I am extremely unhappy with what is in my opinion an excessive and imbalanced plan to consider the area from West Monkseaton/ Murton Village to Shiremoor for housing/ any other development on the	S/7.1 Strategic Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>greenfield sites over the next 15 years. I am especially dismayed that the current elected Mayor and Council (political party noted by my family, neighbours and myself for future elections) have seemingly rapidly produced this ill-balanced plan despite such an emphasis these days on green/ environmental issues. It is disappointing to see that this generation is the generation planning to irreversibly utilise/ lose these Greenfield sites which our predecessors protected to date. In object for the following reasons: - The irreversible loss of valuable and scarce Greenfield sites/ farmland, - The loss of areas of green infrastructure, that help beautify existing communities, and provide excellent opportunities for public recreation and health, - Increasing the likelihood of adverse events such as flooding (recently devastating for local families/ children) and traffic jams (already a worsening issue ruining quality of life and time spent with families/ friends as well as likelihood of accidents). Indeed I am dismayed at the lack of adequate/ meaningful response to West Monkseaton flooding compared to the rapid prioritisation of work on Greenfield development near West Monkseaton. - Brownfield sites should be considered first in addition to favouring derelict land reclamation. - a less than successful record of the Council previously allocating Greenfield sites due to economic considerations, e.g., the acres of empty office space on the Cobalt site. In my view, and many people I know agree, the Plan should promote the redevelopment of all Brownfield, derelict and declining urban areas (including for example empty industrial and office areas) rather than the valuable areas of Greenfields in the West Monkseaton, Murton, Shiremoor and other areas. Finally, I would like to say shame on you, Council, to propose this. I do not recall this being mentioned upfront when your representatives knocked on my door for a vote recently claiming to wish to improve the quality of life of local residents. Myself and many others will certainly not forget this in future elections both local and national. I ask you to kindly reconsider for the sake of Borough residents quality of life and not financial considerations.</p>	
805543	0	LPCD3851	In part	Any and all new developments must be on existing brown field sites. The plan must be amended to include.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
805558	0	LPCD3897	In part	I agree with the concept of Strategic planning, but question how it is working in practice. For example there have been considerable housing development around the Shiremoor area, which happened after the closure of Shiremoor School, which didn't seen good planning. All the new housing in recent years, appears to feed into the existing sewerage systems, which are already inadequate, judging by repeated flooding of hundreds of dwellings. The traffic jams are getting worse at peak times and parking is about impossible in Whitley Bay. Are so many new estates essential when there are so many empty premises and dwellings our town centres.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
805566	0	LPCD3939	In part	Brownfield sites should be exhausted before building on greenfield sites. There should be serious thought given before building on plots 35 to 41. In the June 2012 flood water ran off these fields and flooded West Monkseaton/Monkseaton - building would make this more likely in the future as there will be no open ground to absorb any rain, so any heavy storm could cause similar problems again.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
805860	0	LPCD4180	No	The only reason we "need" these houses is for foreigners. Our country is already overcrowded, we	S/7.1 Strategic



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				already don't have enough green space. White British made up 80% of our country back in 2011 (according to the census). They have been letting more in since then, not to mention the fact that they lie about everything. They already make up 30% of our country, and they are still letting more in. What are we going to do, just keep allowing immigration until our own race is outnumbered in our own country (genocide)? Can anyone imagine China allowing 30% of China to be foreign, then still letting more in? Or Japan? Or Pakistan? We are not doing this to our own race in our own country either. We have to stop immigration, and also begin a repatriation programme to get the numbers back down to a reasonable level.	Housing
792059	RESIDENT	LPCD226	0	Any new estates should have their own amenities built and funded for first 5 years by developer. More landscaping of sites.	7 New Housing
798299	RESIDENT	LPCD2063	0	Think it is better to 'fill in' small and medium sized sites with development rather than large green field sites (such as 35-41 22-28)	7 New Housing
457840	RESIDENT	LPCD3279	0	The land either side of Station Road North Wallsend is still marked as a development site even though there was a lot of objection to this. Are the planners taking into account the potential for flooding due to the concreting in of large areas which normally absorb rain water bearing in mind the increasing amount of rainfall expected in the future.	7 New Housing
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3360	0	Even Proposing to build on the site of an ice rink, football ground, cricket ground and rugby pitch is not acceptable.	7 New Housing
804850	0	LPCD2784	0	Affordable housing must be the main consideration. Built along the A19/A189 corridors	7 New Housing
638471	0	LPCD3719	0	make sure that all new houses have adequate off street parking/	7 New Housing
805504	0	LPCD3755	0	Before you start building affordable housing I think you should look at all the empty houses around the areas and refurbish them to regenerate the villages and get them back up to reasonable areas instead of every were looking neglected and run down and stop the right to buy as there is more need for social housing Abolish the right to buy if people can afford to buy they should buy on the open market not at a reduced rate to sell on at marked value and leave the house for those that could never afford to buy You say affordable housing but the only ones that can afford them are people with good salaries & pensions so they are the ones that buy them as investments and to let first time buyers still can't afford what you charge for them on their wages and don't get on the ladder There is land still around the Northumberland business park earmarked for more offices to be built build houses instead There are hundreds of empty offices standing vacant because money was allocated for them but the government has striped assets and we have no business to use them and they are not affordable for business to use so why not turn some into flats instead and make use of them	7 New Housing
809045	0	LPCD6087	0	I object most strongly to the plans for a massive housing development in North Tyneside's One Core Strategy, which appear to have been formulated without any proper consultation with other councils.	7 New Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
789782	RESIDENT	LPCD5	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		S/7.2 Housing Figures 0
790915	RESIDENT	LPCD11	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	North Tyneside is being over-developed. I've lived here for over twenty years, in that time we've lost thousands (of green belt / farm land) upon thousands of hectares due to housing development. We do not need or require anymore housing development.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
791057	RESIDENT	LPCD27	0	No to all above. Asks who set the requirements.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
791179	RESIDENT	LPCD32	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	We do not have the infrastructure to accommodate all the extra traffic, schools etc. This area is already bursting at the seams! The disruption already being caused by the new housing development opposite our estate will only get worse on completion. We have problems getting on/off the dual carriageway now so have to go through the estate and out via The Beacon pub. Our local schools are heavily subscribed so where will all the children from these new 4/5 bed houses be educated? It will soon be a concrete jungle from Newcastle to the Coast!	S/7.2 Housing Figures
791197	RESIDENT	LPCD35	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing	You are proposing to ruin the Green Belt to provide housing for people who are probably not even NT Council rate payers yet. You should prioritise getting the right people in social housing first - not penalising your tax payers. Who has decided your requirement for new homes - not me - I did not vote for it.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
791307	RESIDENT	LPCD38	growth. Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	None given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
464030	RESIDENT	LPCD86	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
791315	RESIDENT	LPCD48	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	None given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
791316	RESIDENT	LPCD49	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
791349	RESIDENT	LPCD84	Work	none given	S/7.2 Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		Figures
791356	RESIDENT	LPCD101	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			addition al homes.		
791403	RESIDENT	LPCD123	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
791407	RESIDENT	LPCD129	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth,	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
791632	RESIDENT	LPCD163	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
640418	RESIDENT	LPCD301	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			addition al homes.		
791522	RESIDENT	LPCD259	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
791875	RESIDENT	LPCD172	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth,	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
791883	RESIDENT	LPCD177	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
791889	RESIDENT	LPCD194	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
792059	RESIDENT	LPCD212	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792075	RESIDENT	LPCD227	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
792105	RESIDENT	LPCD248	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792364	RESIDENT	LPCD295	Work with our neighbors to meet our	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
792446	RESIDENT	LPCD308	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	We are a continually growing borough. We need houses / buildings that are already empty or derelict to be purchased by developers to create homes for people. Leave our green areas and views for everyone to enjoy.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792499	RESIDENT	LPCD317	Seek another option for meeting the borough	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.		
792501	RESIDENT	LPCD329	0	Does not matter what I or others think. This is just an exercise!!	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792502	RESIDENT	LPCD328	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
396802	RESIDENT	LPCD775	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			Id growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
444595	RESIDENT	LPCD546	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
444604	RESIDENT	LPCD479	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
590145	RESIDENT	LPCD734	Seek another option	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.		
590690	RESIDENT	LPCD349	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792511	RESIDENT	LPCD335	Work with our neighbors to	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
792513	RESIDENT	LPCD342	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
792532	RESIDENT	LPCD377	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792542	RESIDENT	LPCD385	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			12,000 additional homes.		
792546	RESIDENT	LPCD386	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792554	RESIDENT	LPCD389	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792597	RESIDENT	LPCD409	Seek another option for meeting	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.		
792601	RESIDENT	LPCD411	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	None given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792734	RESIDENT	LPCD460	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
792841	RESIDENT	LPCD491	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	None Given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792938	RESIDENT	LPCD512	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792978	RESIDENT	LPCD532	0	ticked all boxes	S/7.2 Housing Figures
792995	RESIDENT	LPCD554	Work	NA	S/7.2 Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		Figures
793005	RESIDENT	LPCD581	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			addition al homes.		
793009	RESIDENT	LPCD618	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	The Council should look at the needs for houses and environmental benefits locally ie. green infrastructure to meet the plans of North Tyneside.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793038	RESIDENT	LPCD645	Plan to meet national populati on projecti ons, about 16,200 addition al homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793045	RESIDENT	LPCD649	Seek another option for meeting the	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.		
793048	RESIDENT	LPCD654	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	None given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793078	RESIDENT	LPCD697	Plan to meet national populati on projecti ons, about 16,200 addition al homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
793131	RESIDENT	LPCD682	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793138	RESIDENT	LPCD689	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	1. Redevelop brownfield sites only 2. Demolish derelict/rundown housing estates and rebuild these. Modernise existing housing stock.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793412	RESIDENT	LPCD721	Work	none given	S/7.2 Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		Figures
793415	RESIDENT	LPCD725	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793443	RESIDENT	LPCD757	Plan to meet national population	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			projecti ons, about 16,200 addition al homes.		
793443	RESIDENT	LPCD770	0	a) Meet national population projections, around 16,200 homes and b) Work with neighbours, about 10,500 to 12,000 homes	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793476	RESIDENT	LPCD793	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	Please do not proceed with this plan to go crazy with building cheap, 'affordable' homes	S/7.2 Housing Figures
396839	RESIDENT	LPCD1372	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			for housing growth.		
396848	RESIDENT	LPCD875	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
444526	RESIDENT	LPCD1357	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth,	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
458166	RESIDENT	LPCD1201	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
466437	RESIDENT	LPCD1296	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000	We don't want the whole of North Tyneside swamped with people and traffic and definitely no immigrants as they may prove to be more problematic and costly as they are worth. Ps we have already had problems with them in Stanley Street.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			addition al homes.		
469404	RESIDENT	LPCD1103	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
469676	RESIDENT	LPCD1585	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for	No more houses no destruction of the green belt, the roads are not capable of taking the extra traffic when will you listen to us who voted you in.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			housing growth.		
471073	RESIDENT	LPCD1308	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	It is already virtually impossible to move in and out of this Borough at peak times. We have too many empty offices and other buildings without building more. Consider the quality of life not enough health and care services for people as it is.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
587868	RESIDENT	LPCD1325	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
641227	RESIDENT	LPCD1145	0	Your requirements, not mine!	S/7.2 Housing Figures
675953	RESIDENT	LPCD1655	Seek another	I think we need to ask ourselves what sort of a North Tyneside do we want? Is it an urban sprawl polluted and congested, or is it something much more pleasant and intelligently designed. What I am	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	less happy with is the extent of your plans for residential development. Overall I accept there may be a need over the next 15 years for some increase in the number of dwellings but not on the scale of your plan. If all this goes ahead the next Strategic plan may well show virtually all of North Tyneside being built on up to the Northumberland border. Northumberland is the emptiest County in the UK and if there are such pressing needs for urban development maybe there is a need for a new town to the north of North Tyneside. It could easily be accomodated. In conclusion, I urge a more restrained growth in housing over the next 10 to 15 years.	
793488	RESIDENT	LPCD827	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793563	RESIDENT	LPCD846	Plan to meet national	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			populati on projecti ons, about 16,200 addition al homes.		
793662	RESIDENT	LPCD893	0	No to development	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793663	RESIDENT	LPCD894	Plan to meet national populati on projecti ons, about 16,200 addition al homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793668	RESIDENT	LPCD906	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth,	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
793738	RESIDENT	LPCD931	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793758	RESIDENT	LPCD956	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
793768	RESIDENT	LPCD969	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793796	RESIDENT	LPCD1011	Work with our neighbors to meet	none give	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
793817	RESIDENT	LPCD1045	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793822	RESIDENT	LPCD1050	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
793868	RESIDENT	LPCD1077	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793893	RESIDENT	LPCD1089	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			require ments for housing growth.		
794009	RESIDENT	LPCD1135	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794018	RESIDENT	LPCD1163	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			ments for housing growth.		
794027	RESIDENT	LPCD1177	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794048	RESIDENT	LPCD1186	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			for housing growth.		
794059	RESIDENT	LPCD1194	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794139	RESIDENT	LPCD1263	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Already overcrowded - with only about 1,200 people on the housing waiting list how can it be justified to build 12,000 new homes? They are not needed.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794158	RESIDENT	LPCD1279	Seek another option	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.		
794159	RESIDENT	LPCD1280	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794185	RESIDENT	LPCD1293	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			e-based requirements for housing growth.		
794204	RESIDENT	LPCD1302	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidenc e-based requirements for housing growth.	Limit the number of new arrivals unless they have proven employment.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794219	RESIDENT	LPCD1310	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794220	RESIDENT	LPCD1312	Work with our neighbo	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
794225	RESIDENT	LPCD1319	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
794238	RESIDENT	LPCD1330	homes. Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794302	RESIDENT	LPCD1334	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			to 12,000 addition al homes.		
794303	RESIDENT	LPCD1345	Seek another option for meeting the borough ’s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794350	RESIDENT	LPCD1387	Plan to meet national populati on projecti ons, about 16,200 addition al homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794358	RESIDENT	LPCD1391	Plan to meet national populati	To achieve the 16,200 homes referred to in (a) my proposal would to incorporate points (b) and (c) making use of all available options to meet targets require, ad affordable mix of housing requirements to reach 16,200 additional homes.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			on projecti ons, about 16,200 addition al homes.		
794562	RESIDENT	LPCD1504	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794566	RESIDENT	LPCD1538	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for	Our services are already seriously overloaded so our schools, roads, council services, and utilities would not be able to cope. For these reasons we should not be proposing development of any kind.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			housing growth.		
794569	RESIDENT	LPCD1507	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794594	RESIDENT	LPCD1523	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
794749	RESIDENT	LPCD1534	growth. Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	No response	S/7.2 Housing Figures
794805	RESIDENT	LPCD1548	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	No to all. No to new homes	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
795013	RESIDENT	LPCD1552	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Redevelop existing run-down and empty properties whether they be residential or commercial. Leave the "Potential Development Sites" as they are.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
795052	RESIDENT	LPCD1553	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
795056	RESIDENT	LPCD1559	Seek	none given	S/7.2 Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			another option for meeting the borough's evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.		Figures
795098	RESIDENT	LPCD1564	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	No response	S/7.2 Housing Figures
795123	RESIDENT	LPCD1570	Work with our	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
795160	RESIDENT	LPCD1581	Seek another option for meeting the borough ’s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
795303	RESIDENT	LPCD1613	Seek another option	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.		
795327	RESIDENT	LPCD1625	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	None given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
795347	RESIDENT	LPCD1627	Work with our neighbors to	No response.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
795496	RESIDENT	LPCD1687	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	No response.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
795566	RESIDENT	LPCD1702	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
795623	RESIDENT	LPCD1717	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			12,000 additional homes.		
795649	RESIDENT	LPCD1722	0	Both a) and c) ticked	S/7.2 Housing Figures
795653	RESIDENT	LPCD1723	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	No Response.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
796557	RESIDENT	LPCD1740	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	All options selected - no additional comment provided	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4947	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	I agree with the statement in para 7.22 and the strategy S/7.3 - i.e. the housing to be developed should be less than that projected by central government and that will cover between 63 % to 71 % of the maximum provision if all suitable sites were used for housing ("if applicable"). This is 8,159 to 9, 659 homes out of 12,950 (see also table on page 77). I believe this reflects the perceived requirement that would be supported by the majority of consultees that responded to a further growth options consultation.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
457989	RESIDENT	LPCD5065	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Evidence based requirements can only be informed guess work surely. 10,500-16,200 seems an awful lot of additional homes to me, especially when they always seem to be built on farm and green belt land.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
462662	RESIDENT	LPCD4951	Seek another option for meeting the	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.		
464454	RESIDENT	LPCD2664	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	Need to work with communities to meet some of the requirements.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
466526	RESIDENT	LPCD2686	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
466979	RESIDENT	LPCD5069	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
467684	RESIDENT	LPCD3567	0	"NO" to the first two points.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
467711	RESIDENT	LPCD2269	Work	none given	S/7.2 Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		Figures
467876	RESIDENT	LPCD4840	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000	Need to work with communities to meet some of the requirements	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			addition al homes.		
468254	RESIDENT	LPCD4572	Seek another option for meeting the borough ’s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	#NAME?	S/7.2 Housing Figures
469523	RESIDENT	LPCD2954	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			al homes.		
470045	RESIDENT	LPCD1950	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
470778	RESIDENT	LPCD3645	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional	I am not convinced that there is such a great demand for more houses judging by the number up for sale in the area.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
471121	RESIDENT	LPCD5059	homes. Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3361	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	There is no point building if there are no job opportunities. Phase the building in line with jobs available. We don't want empty housing estates.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
472725	RESIDENT	LPCD4057	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Preferred level would be that which is genuinely sustainable for the borough, current and future communities and the environment. This would depend on the nature and location of the development rather than setting a target for new homes.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
472956	RESIDENT	LPCD2650	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	Need to work with communities to meet some of the requirements	S/7.2 Housing Figures
588147	RESIDENT	LPCD3318	Work	n/a	S/7.2 Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		Figures
797142	RESIDENT	LPCD1749	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			addition al homes.		
797173	RESIDENT	LPCD1756	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
797201	RESIDENT	LPCD1762	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth,	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
797290	RESIDENT	LPCD1772	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	None Given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
797322	RESIDENT	LPCD1779	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements	None given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
797328	RESIDENT	LPCD1789	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
797361	RESIDENT	LPCD1800	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
797382	RESIDENT	LPCD1823	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
797398	RESIDENT	LPCD1830	Work with our neighbors to meet our	None given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
797412	RESIDENT	LPCD1835	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	While understanding the need for more affordable housing my proposals would give a balance between the need and green space and leisure requirements. I consider 'Option B' as the best compromise to achieve the objective.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
797625	RESIDENT	LPCD1903	Work with our	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
798039	RESIDENT	LPCD2013	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			al homes.		
798041	RESIDENT	LPCD2014	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	No Response.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
798041	RESIDENT	LPCD2015	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing	Existing housing to be used for families not private business- solicitors, Dentals, Doctors surgeries etc. Use should be made of larger shops existing office buildings- old police stations etc for businesses.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			growth.		
798239	RESIDENT	LPCD2051	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	No response	S/7.2 Housing Figures
798282	RESIDENT	LPCD2056	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	No response	S/7.2 Housing Figures
798299	RESIDENT	LPCD2060	Work with our neighbors to meet	No response	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
798574	RESIDENT	LPCD2065	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
798606	RESIDENT	LPCD2071	0		0 S/7.2 Housing



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			to 12,000 addition al homes.		
798687	RESIDENT	LPCD2121	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
798761	RESIDENT	LPCD2151	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			ments for housing growth.		
798782	RESIDENT	LPCD2157	Plan to meet national populati on projecti ons, about 16,200 addition al homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
798995	RESIDENT	LPCD2197	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
800421	RESIDENT	LPCD2307	Work with our neighbo urs to meet	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
800427	RESIDENT	LPCD2311	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
800431	RESIDENT	LPCD2322	Work	NA	S/7.2 Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		Figures
800496	RESIDENT	LPCD2347	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
800519	RESIDENT	LPCD2359	Plan to meet	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.		
800779	RESIDENT	LPCD2365	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
800789	RESIDENT	LPCD2369	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

## RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
801285	RESIDENT	LPCD2286	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
801358	RESIDENT	LPCD2404	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Whilst I appreciate that this project is being urged by the Government, I think it is time the Government considered ending Immigration rather than looking to build on every available square inch of every county in the land. As the saying goes, "when it's gone it's gone" and there's no going back. North Tyneside is a very attractive place to live, with the balance just right between housing, wonderful beaches and wide open spaces. Please don't ruin it with all this proposed building!	S/7.2 Housing Figures
801572	RESIDENT	LPCD2408	Work with our neighbors	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
803190	RESIDENT	LPCD2419	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
803420	RESIDENT	LPCD2441	homes. Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	No Response.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
803472	RESIDENT	LPCD2458	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	To build on existing property sites to enforce property owners/ land owners to keep properties up to living standard and not to leave properties vacated for months/years. Need to employ empty homes officer to make this happen. Too many properties are empty, old public houses standing going to ruin. I strongly oppose building on open green spaces.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
803503	RESIDENT	LPCD2460	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	No response.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
803506	RESIDENT	LPCD2466	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to	No response.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			12,000 additional homes.		
803722	RESIDENT	LPCD2498	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
804918	RESIDENT	LPCD2923	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
804927	RESIDENT	LPCD2927	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
804944	RESIDENT	LPCD2933	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
804998	RESIDENT	LPCD2963	Work with our neighbors to	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
805010	RESIDENT	LPCD2978	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
805051	RESIDENT	LPCD3211	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	I consider the erosion of any greenfield sites unnecessary. There are plenty of brownfield sites along W/Bay seafront. To reduce the need for extra housing the government/councils should be considering policies which reduce the birth rate, especially among unproductive members of society. i.e reducing/remove benefits for more than one child ect.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805053	RESIDENT	LPCD3096	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805060	RESIDENT	LPCD3109	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence	Priority to develop brown field sites. N Tyneside is incapable of huge growth without severe adverse impact on existing residents. New towns are needed, not the endless expansion of existing communities. It is better to loose farm land on a large scale than have piece meal development of open space, green belt ect.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			e-based requirements for housing growth.		
805078	RESIDENT	LPCD3164	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidenc e-based requirements for housing growth.	There should be no development on playing fields or agricultural land.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805085	RESIDENT	LPCD3200	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	I am an environmentally aware member of Friends of the Earth both locally and Nationally, however their view differs from mine, therefore I am writing in an individual capacity.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805172	RESIDENT	LPCD3250	Work with our neighbo	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
805216	RESIDENT	LPCD3262	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
805237	RESIDENT	LPCD3278	homes. Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805242	RESIDENT	LPCD3293	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			to 12,000 addition al homes.		
805248	RESIDENT	LPCD3303	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805252	RESIDENT	LPCD3311	Seek another option for meeting the borough ’s evidenc e-based require	I feel the way things are going is that every green space in North Tyneside will be covered in concrete! We will have to travel miles to find some trees and green space. Brownfield sites must be considered first for housing and business. But all of this building will happen anyway regardless of objections...!	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			ments for housing growth.		
805257	RESIDENT	LPCD3315	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805265	RESIDENT	LPCD3331	Plan to meet national populati on projecti ons, about 16,200 addition al homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805268	RESIDENT	LPCD3340	Work with our neighbo urs to meet	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
805343	RESIDENT	LPCD3478	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	N/A	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805381	RESIDENT	LPCD3575	Work with our neighbors to meet our	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
805396	RESIDENT	LPCD3606	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805404	RESIDENT	LPCD3632	Seek another option for meeting the borough	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

## RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			â€™s evidence-based requirements for housing growth.		
805428	RESIDENT	LPCD3653	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
806212	RESIDENT	LPCD4342	0	There is not a massive demand for housing in the north east, and the fact that prices in northumberland have fallen by 1% in the last year, and more prior to this, illustrates that any increase in demand elsewhere is not matched in this area. Are you planning to build ghost estates such as in Ireland where massive demolition programmes are following the boom time expansions ? I believe your projections of population for this area are unrealistically large. The economic performance disparities affecting the North east, compared to the South, will not be solved by building empty houses in important green areas.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807156	RESIDENT	LPCD4829	Work with our neighbours to meet our	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
807162	RESIDENT	LPCD4837	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807169	RESIDENT	LPCD4844	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
807188	RESIDENT	LPCD4869	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807269	RESIDENT	LPCD4961	Work with our neighbo	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			urs to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
807315	RESIDENT	LPCD4984	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
807330	RESIDENT	LPCD4993	homes. Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807414	RESIDENT	LPCD5019	homes. Work with our neighbors to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
807446	RESIDENT	LPCD5051	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807544	RESIDENT	LPCD5078	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
396641	RESIDENT	LPCD5900	0	I agree that housing is needed to continue with the present needs and also future needs of the	S/7.2 Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				population and local business concerns.	Figures
464488	RESIDENT	LPCD5473	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
469684	RESIDENT	LPCD5714	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
470965	RESIDENT	LPCD6706	0	<p>Whilst the Councils consider that they have fulfilled this duty as set out in the Statement (SD5), including the Memorandum of Understanding, we do not consider that this has been carried through into the preparation of the plan, including the evidence base. Whilst references are made to working with Newcastle City Council and Northumberland Council regarding the agreed approach to housing delivery in the area the stance is one of stable growth. The Strategy in the emerging Local Plan is, therefore, one of restricted growth with the onus now placed on the adjoining authorities to accommodate working age families. The overall requirement has been identified as between 10,500 and 12,000 new homes for the period 2013 to 2030 which is below the level projected on the basis of proposed annual household growth with reference to historic trends. These figures indicate a need for 16,300 homes between 2013 and 2030. This has allowed Newcastle City Council to pursue Green Belt release as part of its emerging development plan strategy to prevent out migration to more attractive environments so as to drive economic growth in Newcastle and Gateshead. Giving due consideration to the 'duty to cooperate', to which the Inspectorate is giving significant weight when examining development plan documents, we do not consider that this approach to be sound as it requires the release of substantial Green Belt land. The scope for accommodating the required additional household growth of Newcastle City within adjoining boroughs should be explored more fully and representations have been submitted to the Pre Submission Draft of the Newcastle Gateshead Core Strategy on behalf of Mr and Mrs Manners in this regard. We, therefore, respectfully request that consideration is also given to the potential for our clients eastern land holdings, as shown on the attached plan, to accommodate residential development.</p>	S/7.2 Housing Figures
471031	RESIDENT	LPCD6168	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
471296	RESIDENT	LPCD5586	Seek	This still seems a lot of housing. Excellent to work with neighbouring areas but please ensure needs are	S/7.2 Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	not overestimated	Figures
589055	RESIDENT	LPCD5983	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	The choices of development would be to strike a balance between growth and development. I strongly doubt the government's motives for future.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
803337	RESIDENT	LPCD5437	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared	Having read the details of the plan I am wondering whether all these developments are required as most housing is going to be needed in the south of the country. The borough appears to be taken over by building work, construction does get the economy going and competition is good for market but there is a danger that this can cause a bubble with salaries stagnating and costs rising. Also it can have a reverse affect as it is good for people wishing to buy their own house but in these days will property prices cover costs for the care of the elderly. High Streets are struggling with out of town shopping areas, is future retail building a necessity.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
807743	RESIDENT	LPCD5100	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807758	RESIDENT	LPCD5131	Work with our neighbo	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			urs to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
807779	RESIDENT	LPCD5156	Seek another option for meeting the borough’s evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807790	RESIDENT	LPCD5180	Seek another option for	Who/what has supplied these population/employment evidence based requirements? “ What evidence? Is immigration into the UK and all local authorities being anticipated here? I consider North Tyneside sufficiently “built up” already “ evidence traffic congestion at peak times e.g. Silverlink/Holystone (including the exit from Cobalt! etc.) Grid lock. If any development is required	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	brownfield sites should be used first. We need to protect our green spaces and sporting facilities, sports fields etc To encourage a fit and healthy society (I recall back to late 70's when North Tyneside Council sold off numerous sports fields " for housing) UK has one of Western Europe's highest obesity levels already.	
807799	RESIDENT	LPCD5184	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807810	RESIDENT	LPCD5186	Work with our neighbors to meet	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
807825	RESIDENT	LPCD5207	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807835	RESIDENT	LPCD5215	0	North Tyneside Council should impose a ten year moratorium on building sites on green field sites. During this period building should only be allowed on brownfield sites.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807842	RESIDENT	LPCD5220	Work with our neighbours to	There does appear to be something of a crisis in the U.K. at present as far as the availability of housing is concerned and this must be addressed if the economic recovery is to be maintained. With this in mind we accept that many new houses need to be built in this country as a whole and that North Tyneside Council must be prepared to deliver its share of such properties. The quoted lower number of	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	between 10,500 and 12,000 does seem reasonable. Such development MUST include a proportion of affordable homes.	
807899	RESIDENT	LPCD5240	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807900	RESIDENT	LPCD5242	Work with our neighbors to meet	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
807951	RESIDENT	LPCD5314	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Impossible to express a preference in absence of evidence on which it is to be based.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808003	RESIDENT	LPCD5337	Work with our neighbors to meet our	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures

## RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
808018	RESIDENT	LPCD5340	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808047	RESIDENT	LPCD5370	Seek another	Personally would encourage North Tyneside Council to resist UK government overtures to do their bit and embark on an excessive house building scheme. Whilst the capital and south east are suffering	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	from migratory pressures it does not follow that the local authorities in the north east should apply the same factors to their planning decisions. Your duty is to protect the Borough for future generations.	
808086	RESIDENT	LPCD5414	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808091	RESIDENT	LPCD5417	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared require	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
808108	RESIDENT	LPCD5439	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808138	RESIDENT	LPCD5479	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures



RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
808139	RESIDENT	LPCD5490	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808157	RESIDENT	LPCD5498	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
808173	RESIDENT	LPCD5520	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808189	RESIDENT	LPCD5551	Work with our neighbors to meet our	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
808201	RESIDENT	LPCD5567	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808202	RESIDENT	LPCD5568	0	No to all options Why are the people who discuss planning for the future so apposed to having farmland in this area? Is the reason because the building firms who put their profits before the environment push them in their favour. What is wrong with fields being used for food production instead of house building. After all is said and done we cannot eat houses but we can eat corn. To me the whole thing is based on greed and we keep hearing this cliché affordable housing, affordable for whom? Not the thousands of young people in our country who cannot find work and have no chance of getting a mortgage. Instead of wasting money on housing that many will never be able to afford, the	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				money would be better spent on training our young people for their future and the future of our country. This house building kind of thing is not only happening throughout our area but the whole of our country and if in future a crisis may arise as that of the 1940s or some world disaster then the people of this country will have no chance and will starve in their millions. But we will have plenty of houses.	
808309	RESIDENT	LPCD5663	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808349	RESIDENT	LPCD5687	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808372	RESIDENT	LPCD5692	Seek another option for	Build on brownfield sites only. This proposed build will desecrate the whole area, no thought gone into this.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.		
808545	RESIDENT	LPCD5757	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808570	RESIDENT	LPCD5768	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
808597	RESIDENT	LPCD5796	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808615	RESIDENT	LPCD5815	Seek another option for meeting the	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.		
808629	RESIDENT	LPCD5825	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808638	RESIDENT	LPCD5837	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
808662	RESIDENT	LPCD5881	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808699	RESIDENT	LPCD5897	Work with our neighbo	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
808797	RESIDENT	LPCD5945	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			homes.		
808835	RESIDENT	LPCD5975	0	Both b) and c) ticked	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808938	RESIDENT	LPCD6070	0	We have briefly examined the Consultation Draft and our comments are set out below. We reluctantly accept that some development will be necessary and we assume that the expected population growth is interpolated from current growth from within the Borough and not imposed by Central Government.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
809117	RESIDENT	LPCD6249	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
809130	RESIDENT	LPCD6267	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for	n/a	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
809133	RESIDENT	LPCD6284	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
809803	RESIDENT	LPCD6639	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based require	1. It has been stated that this Borough needs a lot more housing, yet the reasoning behind this claim is not easy to discover. It may be appropriate to consider a few factors before accepting the validity of the claim. In other words, is the claim actually correct? 2. Every other borough in Tyne and Wear is losing population, so it may well be that NT will follow suit in the next generation. 3. If/when the recovery gets under way, it is very likely indeed that every other part of the UK will reap the benefits before the North East " and this will be much more probable if Scotland votes for independence. So, there are strong possibilities the the demand for housing in this region will continue to decrease in the short term " and even more possible in the medium term. 4. There has been a considerable increase in houses built over the last few years, e.g. in the order of 2,000 homes in the Shiremoor/Backworth area alone. In very rough figures, that is equivalent to one new dwelling per 100 residents of the borough, and in just one quadrant of the borough: those figures could, quite logically, be extrapolated.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			ments for housing growth.	If each new home holds 3 new residents, the increase in population needs to be 3%: has such an increase occurred and is one likely? That figure of 3% does not, of course, pretend to be accurate, yet there are more homes to be built within this same quadrant so the overall effect could be more striking. For example, it may well be that the actual increase in the North East quadrant is more than one new home per 25 residents of that zone, so the population growth would be in the order of 12%!	
451166	0	LPCD242	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	na	S/7.2 Housing Figures
631932	0	LPCD279	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
792975	0	LPCD528	homes. Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
588587	0	LPCD1127	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
0	0	LPCD2620	Plan to meet national population projections, about	Fairhurst note that Policy S/7.2 "Housing Figures" of the Consultation Draft Local Plan states that North Tyneside's objectively assessed requirement for net housing delivery between 2013 and 2030 is estimated at 16,272 net additional homes but that, working in partnership with Newcastle City Council and Northumberland County Council, the anticipated requirement could be reduced to between 10,500 and 12,000 net additional homes over the period 2013 to 2030. Fairhurst have reviewed the evidence base of the Consultation Draft Local Plan and would raise significant concerns regarding the level of demonstration that has been provided that the Newcastle and Northumberland administrative areas can accommodate between 4272 and 5772 of North Tyneside's objectively	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			16,200 additional homes.	assessed requirement. Fairhurst are fully aware that both Newcastle and Northumberland are progressing emerging Local Plans which aim to provide sufficient housing to retain and attract working age families. The principle of taking a strategic, cross boundary approach to stemming out mitigation from Newcastle to North Tyneside is accepted. However, in the absence of detailed justification as to how this will be delivered, Fairhurst are concerned that strategic housing requirements will not be met. Fairhurst are aware of the Memorandum of Understanding which exists between the Tyne and Wear local authorities. However, Fairhurst consider that significant additional evidence will need to be presented by NTC to meet the requirements of the Duty to Co-operate. At present, it is very difficult to effectively comment on the spatial distribution of housing numbers as set out in Policy S/7.3 "Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites" as the published evidence base of the overall housing figures is not sound.	
458324	0	LPCD2136	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures
590531	0	LPCD2216	Seek another option for meeting	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.		
591698	0	LPCD3117	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	NT is already over populated and suffers badly during recessions. We should be aiming to stabilise the population numbers.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
592444	0	LPCD3607	0	Other concerns, which will affect residents are: € Over population/over crowding	S/7.2 Housing Figures
592447	0	LPCD3629	0	Other concerns, which will affect residents are: € Over population/over crowding	S/7.2 Housing Figures
594633	0	LPCD2104	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.		
638474	0	LPCD2032	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	No response	S/7.2 Housing Figures
793117	0	LPCD2332	Seek another option	Demand for extra housing across the NE should be met by developing existing towns. In N Tyneside there is limited scope for more housing and there should be no further significant developments east of the A19. The infrastructure of W Bay, M'Seaton, Cullercoats, Tynemouth and S Shields is all ready	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	saturated. Further development would damage these areas to the detriment of existing residents.	
799636	0	LPCD2249	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	look to develop areas where housing has been abandoned / laid derelict. I cannot see the need for all these houses in such a small area!	S/7.2 Housing Figures
800362	0	LPCD2279	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence	I am unconvinced by the rationale put forward. I suggest that the population growth figures are re-examined and scrutinised more appropriately, as the level of housing proposed appears excessive. I am concerned about the volume of new housing proposed to be built in the area and the negative impact this will have on roads (congestion), local infrastructure (schools, hospitals etc.....) and competition for jobs. I think a direct link should be created between the number of new homes built and the number of new jobs created in the area. If we do not do this, then there is a serious risk that the jobs to support population growth will not exist and unemployment will rise.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			e-based requirements for housing growth.		
803493	0	LPCD2813	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	The housing requirements for North Tyneside are closely dependent on the provision / availability of housing in Newcastle and South East Northumberland. It is essential that the councils work together to determine housing needs and locations for new housing. North Tyneside should initially be concentrating on utilising its existing brown field and available in-fill sites for development. Sites should be being released on an incremental basis to meet new housing development requirements, thus minimising the need for extensive and unnecessary new infrastructure facilities. The release of the few remaining existing green field sites in North Tyneside for new housing should be minimised and avoided where possible. Building on the greenfield sites east of the A19, (sites 35-41) and East of Killingworth, (sites 22-26) should only be as a last resort if required and then only towards the end of the 15 year planning period.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
804541	0	LPCD5087	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for	NA	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
804595	0	LPCD2685	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Please do not allow any further intrusion into the green belt or our existing open spaces. Most notably from Earsdon across to Rake Lane. allowing such developments would see existing areas merge into one. For example Shiremoor and Wellfield would become one conurbation area. The already heavily and over used transport routes in these are could not cope with the increase demand developments of this scale would cause. The Council and Officers should be actively seek to identify other sites that are more suitable for housing development without further intrusion into the our open spaces. For example the Avenue PH, the site of Sylvester ballroom and the run down and direlict areas of the Fish Quay and Tanners Bank.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
804850	0	LPCD2783	Work with our neighbors to meet our shared requirements for household	There are already thousands of existing houses for sale in the borough and in surrounding areas such as Newcastle and Northumberland. These figures must be closely monitored before any consideration is given to new development	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			Id growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.		
804904	0	LPCD4566	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Overall a very poor plan, badly communicated. Back to the drawing board. And lastly I would say 16k people would only come if cheap housing was built for them! If it wasn't there then you wouldn't have your hypothetical problem!	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805211	0	LPCD3787	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements	The "evidence-based requirements for housing growth" included in the Local Plan are flawed, which could lead to significantly more houses being built than are required. 1) The requirements included in the Plan are based almost solely on ONS forecasts - there is no guarantee that these are accurate in any way. Further work should be undertaken to compile a more rigorous evidence base on which to build the Local Plan. If not a more conservative approach should be adopted and fewer houses built. 2) The ONS forecasts are based on household growth over the 5 years to 2011, where household growth was higher than it had been for the 15 year period prior to this. What work has the council undertaken to determine the causes of the higher growth levels in the 5 years to 2011 and assess whether those trends are likely to persist? 3) It should be noted that already the ONS forecasts for household growth (however accurate or inaccurate) are two years out of date and will be further out of date by the time the Local Plan is finally approved. 4) Over the last 20 years the average annual household growth was just 471 per annum, compared to around 900 per annum currently assumed in the Local Plan. Between	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			for housing growth.	1991 and 2006, average annual household growth was at most 425 per annum, and just 149 in the 5 years to 1996. The level of growth assumed over the life of the Plan is thus almost double the long run average. The 20 year average household growth figure is a more reliable base on which to construct the Local Plan. 5) According to information contained in the Local Plan document there were 993 long term vacant properties in the borough, as at September 2011. If these were brought back into use, that would equate to around 2 years of household growth using the 20 year average household growth figure as a benchmark. 6) There is no mention in the Local Plan document of the capacity of the rental market in North Tyneside to absorb any increase in the number of households in the borough. It is likely that there is ample existing rental accommodation currently available to mitigate the need for at least some of the house building proposed in the Plan. Has this even been considered by the Council? I think it is unlikely that there needs to be as much new house building as is currently proposed in the Local Plan. Around 6,000 to 7,000 new homes over the Plan period should be the maximum requirement. The Council MUST revisit and compile a more rigorous evidence base supporting the need for new house building.	
805386	0	LPCD3644	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Use of brownfield sites must be the first option for any housing growth or N Tyneside will lose all its green space and will become an area people won't want to live in. Having a diverse housing stock does make sense on the face of it however with increasing fuel prices and low economic growth it is not more advisable to be building more small to medium sized houses rather than a higher level of executive homes.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805403	0	LPCD3723	Seek another option for meeting the borough	A Continue Review process be in place to manage and plan future development needs linked to a shorter term five year forecast, This should provide more realistic requirements,	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.		
805479	0	LPCD4513	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	Is there really a demand for housing? Are people moving into the region? What has happened to all those terraced streets which were sold off cheap in the region? I challenge the need for more housing.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805543	0	LPCD3858	Seek another option for meeting the borough â€™s evidenc e-based require ments for	There is no substantiated evidence of any housing growth requirement. Until this is the case then nothing should be done. Also, any and all new development must be on existing brown field sites.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			housing growth.		
805554	0	LPCD3890	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	The figures presented for projected population growth and housing needs are grossly over estimated. For the period 1991 to 2011 the population grew by 7,000 yet an increase of 30,000 is projected for the 19 year period to 2030. Brownfield development must be the focus to service the increased housing stock requirement but the requirement I feel is grossly over estimated and no credible evidence provided to support it.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805568	0	LPCD4511	0	Has the council also looked at how many empty properties there are in the borough including private lets and offices? I have asked this question but have never been given a clear answer - surely we need to know this before calculating how many new developments are needed.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
805902	0	LPCD4206	0	I am writing to object most strongly to the plans for a massive housing development in North Tyneside's One Core Strategy, which appear to have been formulated without any proper consultation with other councils.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
588681	0	LPCD6231	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for	I am worried that this Government is just dictating to councils that so many thousands of homes need to be built in order to kick start the economy. Losing the precious green areas is a large price to pay. I am worried that North Tyneside is just developing into one large built up area with more houses, apartments and care homes. The roads are becoming more and more congested, any green areas identified such as the Rising Sun Country Park are being surrounded by more and more housing which threatens to cut the green areas off from the wildlife corridors. This in turn makes wildlife more vulnerable to being hit by traffic and also threatens to bring problems where wildlife comes into contact with people (urban foxes). We have built on their land and they have no choice but to use ours.	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			housing growth.		
591119	0	LPCD5276	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	Both box b and c were selected	S/7.2 Housing Figures
797386	0	LPCD6085	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	I very much doubt that there is a need for up to 12,000 extra homes by 2030. It seems that the figure of 16,000 projected for NT is simply based on a national projection, ie, the population will grow by x%, so NTs population will grow by that percentage - but one should not simply extrapolate the general figure. It is clear that there is a desperate need for more homes in London and the south east; but the evidence here is to the contrary. For example: birth rates are generally decreasing; it is very unlikely that immigrants will come to live here; there are empty homes in this area; recent new housing that has been built here has not sold; property sale prices in the area are still stagnant, indicating no shortage. In the absence of a major new employer coming to the area, eg Nissan, there is no real evidence that the NT population is set to increase, other than very modestly. (It is also worth noting that in the adjoining areas of Walker and Heaton, there are also many empty properties.) One of the main reasons why people live in this area is the fact that there are green areas and the area is not over-populated; there is a feeling of space and an ability to walk along the street, on the coast, in the parks, without being crowded. Substantial more housing would change the nature of the area. Any increase in housing would, amongst other things, lead to an increase in traffic on the roads and pressure on public transport. Whilst it is currently possible to travel on the roads, buses and metro without too much difficulty ( this is another reason why it is a desirable place to live), anything other than a modest increase in housing will cause overloading and will have an adverse effect on the current residents.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808166	0	LPCD5518	Seek	The Council should seek to meet its own needs and minimise allocations for adjoining areas,	S/7.2 Housing



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			another option for meeting the borough's evidenc e-based require ments for housing growth.	redeveloping land wherever possible	Figures
808294	0	LPCD5635	Work with our neighbo urs to meet our shared require ments for househo ld growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 addition al homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
806189	0	LPCD4329	Seek another	Please look after our environment -population figures suggest we do not need the massive amount of (residential ) building Councils are trying to push; try using brown field sites first and preserve	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
			option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	greenfield and green belt sites. What will be left for future generations?	
789782	RESIDENT	LPCD9	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
791057	RESIDENT	LPCD29	0	No more housing!!! You are obviously catering for people who don't mind living on top of each other, some of us actually don't need to live near schools/huge supermarkets. My children have grown up. I will be one of the ones moving out of Whitley Bay (it is more like "shameless" every day) as soon as I find suitable alternative. Back to a labour mayor - obviously.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
464030	RESIDENT	LPCD91	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
791179	RESIDENT	LPCD34	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
791197	RESIDENT	LPCD37	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Housing Development Sites
791346	RESIDENT	LPCD81	0	Remain rural!	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
791349	RESIDENT	LPCD92	0	All qualities listed above are of equal importance. Locals and I have signed petitions against a large site next to Lockey Park and many housing of various sizes will affect much wildlife.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
791356	RESIDENT	LPCD103	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
791403	RESIDENT	LPCD125	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
791407	RESIDENT	LPCD131	0	Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools): 2 Close to places of work: 1 Close to public transport networks: 6 Provides a range of different types of housing: 8 Provides affordable housing: 5 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas): 2 Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities: 6 Financially capable of being developed: 8 Development densities in keeping with the local area: 1 Can provide appropriately-sized gardens: 1 Can accommodate new businesses: 5 Other - Lots of open space: 1	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
791632	RESIDENT	LPCD164	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
791632	RESIDENT	LPCD171	0	Too much development already in Whitley Bay and causing problems on roads and local services.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Housing Development Sites
791875	RESIDENT	LPCD174	0	Rank 1 - "Financially capable of being developed Development" and "densities in keeping with the local area"Rank 2 - "Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools)", "Close to public transport networks", "Provides affordable housing", "Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas)", "Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities", and "Can accomodate new businesses"Also added "ensure increased traffic can be controlled"	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
791883	RESIDENT	LPCD180	0	Preference 1: Use of derelict sites for building. Brown field sites.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
640418	RESIDENT	LPCD303	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
791522	RESIDENT	LPCD261	0	Also - existing facilities (roads, schools) are not overloaded.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
791883	RESIDENT	LPCD190	0	I do not believe any greenfield sites around the Rising Sun Country Park should be built on. Nor should there be any building on land at Earsdon and Shiremoor. They provide valuable areas of open space for recreation, walking, cycling ect. Once built on gone for ever!	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
791889	RESIDENT	LPCD196	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792059	RESIDENT	LPCD214	0	Other comments against ranking - Must not be 'modern' slums. Wide doors for wheelchair access.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development Sites
792075	RESIDENT	LPCD229	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
792105	RESIDENT	LPCD251	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
792364	RESIDENT	LPCD297	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
792446	RESIDENT	LPCD313	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
792499	RESIDENT	LPCD319	0	There are areas which cannot take any more traffic. Development should be in areas where there is access to main roads: Coast Road or A19. Prefer to see development of existing housing or brownfield sites.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
792501	RESIDENT	LPCD334	0	What about traffic problems on already congested roads.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
792511	RESIDENT	LPCD337	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development

## RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Sites
792513	RESIDENT	LPCD348	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
396802	RESIDENT	LPCD777	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
444595	RESIDENT	LPCD550	0	Not prone to flooding - appropriate drains etc put in	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
444604	RESIDENT	LPCD483	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
590145	RESIDENT	LPCD736	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
590690	RESIDENT	LPCD366	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792513	RESIDENT	LPCD351	0	Living in Whitley Bay congestion on the roads is already horrendous before the new development at Wellfield has completed.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
792532	RESIDENT	LPCD380	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792532	RESIDENT	LPCD383	0	Whilst recognising the need for more mixed housing in the area I just hope that not every available space will be targeted.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792542	RESIDENT	LPCD394	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792546	RESIDENT	LPCD388	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792554	RESIDENT	LPCD391	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792601	RESIDENT	LPCD416	0	Priority 1 Close to public transport networks Provides a range of different types of housing Provides affordable housing Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities Financially capable of being developed Can provide appropriately-sized gardens Priority 5 Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) Close to places of work Priority 11 Can accommodate new businesses	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792668	RESIDENT	LPCD457	0	Ranked as "1"Financially capable of being developed Development densities in keeping with the local area Ranked as "2"Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) Provides a range of different types of housing Provides affordable housing Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) Ranked as "3"Close to places of work Close to public transport networks Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities Ranked as "5"Can provide appropriately-sized gardens Can accommodate new businesses Look to utilise brown field sites: renovate old buildings no longer used:	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				there are a large amount of empty buildings that could be used for affordable housing: similarly re-energising shops no longer in business.	
792734	RESIDENT	LPCD462	0	Layout of Question 3 is a mess - if you can't do this properly ho do you exect to plan housing developments!	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792841	RESIDENT	LPCD495	0	Council owned new builds and refurbishments for rent only.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792938	RESIDENT	LPCD514	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792978	RESIDENT	LPCD543	0	Ticked all options as 1.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
792995	RESIDENT	LPCD559	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
793009	RESIDENT	LPCD623	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
793038	RESIDENT	LPCD647	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Sites
793045	RESIDENT	LPCD652	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
793048	RESIDENT	LPCD651	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
793078	RESIDENT	LPCD675	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
793131	RESIDENT	LPCD684	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
793138	RESIDENT	LPCD691	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
793403	RESIDENT	LPCD713	0	Don't build houses miles away from work/shops and vise versa. Build sensibly not like the office on Cobalt Estate. Cobalt Business Park is a perfect example of non-thinking Council departments un-used office (greenhouses) still empty after years to expensive for most firms even to rent.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
793412	RESIDENT	LPCD723	0	All are equally important	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
793415	RESIDENT	LPCD732	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793437	RESIDENT	LPCD753	0	n/a	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793443	RESIDENT	LPCD759	0	5. Close to places of work 6. Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities 7. Can accommodate new businesses 7. Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) 8. Provides a range of different types of housing 8. Provides affordable housing 9. Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) 9. Close to public transport networks 9. Can provide appropriately-sized gardens 10. Financially capable of being developed 10. Development densities in keeping with the local area	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
396839	RESIDENT	LPCD1374	0	Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) - 1 Close to places of work - 3 Close to public transport networks - 1 Provides a range of different types of housing - 1 Provides affordable housing - 1 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) - 2 Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities - 2 Financially capable of being developed - 2 Development densities in keeping with the local area - 1 Can provide appropriately-sized gardens - 3 Can accommodate new businesses - 1	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
396848	RESIDENT	LPCD877	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
444526	RESIDENT	LPCD1359	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
458166	RESIDENT	LPCD1203	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
461977	RESIDENT	LPCD1693	No	No more housing. I don't want more flooding the roads can't take the extra traffic when will you listen to the people of the Borough.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
466437	RESIDENT	LPCD1298	0	Use "existing employment land" for housing/employment.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
469404	RESIDENT	LPCD1106	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
471073	RESIDENT	LPCD1329	No	North Tyneside is already full and gridlocked don't need any more development.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
641227	RESIDENT	LPCD1147	0	Selected the following: Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) Close to public transport networks Provides a range of different types of housing	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
675953	RESIDENT	LPCD1682	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
793005	RESIDENT	LPCD854	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
793476	RESIDENT	LPCD795	0		S/7.3 Distribtion

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					of Potential Housing Development Sites
793488	RESIDENT	LPCD831	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793563	RESIDENT	LPCD848	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793663	RESIDENT	LPCD898	0	Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) - 1 Close to places of work - 1 Close to public transport networks - 1 Provides a range of different types of housing - 1 Provides affordable housing - 1 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) - 1 Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities - 1 Financially capable of being developed - 1 Can accommodate new businesses - 7	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793668	RESIDENT	LPCD908	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793738	RESIDENT	LPCD933	0	Other - minimal impact on support networks e.g. GP surgeries / traffic density / schools	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793754	RESIDENT	LPCD950	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793758	RESIDENT	LPCD958	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Housing Development Sites
793768	RESIDENT	LPCD971	0	Other - utilisation of existing brownfield sites. 'Accommodation of new businesses' means those that will serve the community, e.g. shops, medical centres, pubs, library, community centres, scout huts etc. Other facilities must include consideration of schools & nurseries. 'Appropriate' gardens might mean no garden.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793796	RESIDENT	LPCD1013	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793817	RESIDENT	LPCD1047	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793822	RESIDENT	LPCD1052	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793868	RESIDENT	LPCD1078	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793893	RESIDENT	LPCD1091	0	Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) - 5 Close to places of work - 5 Close to public transport networks - 4 Provides a range of different types of housing - 9 Provides affordable housing - 3 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) - 3 Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities - 3 Financially capable of being developed - 3 Development densities in keeping with the local area - 1 Can provide appropriately-sized gardens - 2 Can accommodate new businesses - 4	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793926	RESIDENT	LPCD1109	0	Other - local authority housing is what we really require now	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Housing Development Sites
794009	RESIDENT	LPCD1137	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794018	RESIDENT	LPCD1165	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794027	RESIDENT	LPCD1178	0	Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) - 1 Close to places of work - 3 Close to public transport networks - 1 Provides a range of different types of housing - 3 Provides affordable housing - 3 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) - 1 Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities - 1 Financially capable of being developed - 1 Development densities in keeping with the local area - 3 Can provide appropriately-sized gardens - 3 Can accommodate new businesses - 1	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794048	RESIDENT	LPCD1187	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794059	RESIDENT	LPCD1196	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794101	RESIDENT	LPCD1228	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794119	RESIDENT	LPCD1249	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Housing Development Sites
794139	RESIDENT	LPCD1265	0	There are many brownfield sites available	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794158	RESIDENT	LPCD1283	0	All ticked: Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) Financially capable of being developed	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794185	RESIDENT	LPCD1295	0	Not on the green bet (1)	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794204	RESIDENT	LPCD1307	0	Use only land that already has planning permission or is already being used.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794220	RESIDENT	LPCD1316	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794225	RESIDENT	LPCD1333	0	Ranked as 7: provides affordable housing Ranked as 8: Close to public transport safe access to local amenities Can accomodate new business Ranked as 9: close to facilities financially capable of being developed I still support your stable growth options on brownfield sites, not greenfield sites.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794238	RESIDENT	LPCD1332	0	Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) - 5 Close to places of work - 5 Close to public transport networks - 3 Provides a range of different types of housing - 1 Provides affordable housing - 1 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) - 2 Can bring improvements to the quality	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				and range of local facilities - 1 Financially capable of being developed - 2 Development densities in keeping with the local area - 3 Can provide appropriately-sized gardens - 4 Can accommodate new businesses - 3	Development Sites
794302	RESIDENT	LPCD1336	0	Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) - 5 Close to places of work - 11 Close to public transport networks - 7 Provides a range of different types of housing - 2 Provides affordable housing - 2 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) - 1 Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities - 1 Financially capable of being developed - 3 Development densities in keeping with the local area - 11 Can provide appropriately-sized gardens - 11 Can accommodate new businesses - 11	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794350	RESIDENT	LPCD1389	0	Sufficient housing without gardens, for people who do not have the time, inclination or physical strength for gardening. People with hayfever need homes without gardens too.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794358	RESIDENT	LPCD1393	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
794566	RESIDENT	LPCD1546	0	Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) - 7 Close to places of work - 8 Close to public transport networks - 8 Provides a range of different types of housing - 6 Provides affordable housing - 5 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) - 3 Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities - 2 Financially capable of being developed - 1 Development densities in keeping with the local area - 2 Can provide appropriately-sized gardens - 9 Can accommodate new businesses - 9	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
794569	RESIDENT	LPCD1509	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
794594	RESIDENT	LPCD1525	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
794805	RESIDENT	LPCD1550	0	All options ranked as 11	S/7.3 Distribution



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					of Potential Housing Development Sites
795013	RESIDENT	LPCD1557	No	None - redevelopment needed to maintain the "unique character and attractiveness of our Borough as well as provide the land for the jobs and homes to meet our needs" as you have stated.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
795052	RESIDENT	LPCD1556	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
795056	RESIDENT	LPCD1561	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
795098	RESIDENT	LPCD1569	0	Must have enough schools to cope	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
795123	RESIDENT	LPCD1572	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
795160	RESIDENT	LPCD1586	0	Anywhere that is not Monkseaton	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
795294	RESIDENT	LPCD1612	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential 0

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Housing Development Sites
795303	RESIDENT	LPCD1617	0	Selected: Provides a range of different types of housing Development densities in keeping with the local area	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
795347	RESIDENT	LPCD1634	0	Some priorities given the same rank: Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities (1) Financially capable of being developed (1) Development densities in keeping with the local area (1) Can provide appropriately sized gardens (2) Close to public transport networks (2) Close to facilities (4) Safe access to local amenities (4) Close to places of work (6) Provides affordable housing (8) Can accommodate new business (9) Provides a range of different housing (11)	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
795496	RESIDENT	LPCD1692	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
795566	RESIDENT	LPCD1705	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
795623	RESIDENT	LPCD1721	0	1. Provides a range of different types of housing 1. Provides affordable housing 2. Close to public transport networks 2. Safe access to local amenities 3. Development densities in keeping with the local area 3. Can provide appropriately-sized gardens 5. Close to facilities 5. Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities 5. Close to places of work 6. Financially capable of being developed 7. Can accommodate new businesses	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
795649	RESIDENT	LPCD1724	No	Burradon housing - you have no reference but Burradon could provide a substantial area for new housing. Transport links including new hospital	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4950	Yes	This may not be the most appropriate point for this comment but - 1. - sites 35 to 39 (Murton area) are susceptible to 1 in 75 year flooding and sites 40 and 41 (also Murton area) and only slightly at risk - according to displays on the Potential Sites Background Paper. These areas which are mostly currently	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				agricultural land has poor drainage and large pools of water have been seen even after much less rainfall.This may be due to layers of clay which impede flow to groundwater levels. Potential developers should be asked to carry out ground surveys to establish the risk of poor drainage to groundwater levels to all sites that are currently greenfield to aid in establishing the suitability of proposed housing densities. 2. Site 47 currently have important, long term leisure facilities and should not be developed for any further housing. 3. I am unfamiliar with the large sites further to the east so cannot comment on these.	Development Sites
462662	RESIDENT	LPCD4956	0	Other comment submitted - Good Employment opportunities	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
464454	RESIDENT	LPCD2666	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
466526	RESIDENT	LPCD2688	0	Other: attractive/desirable location.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
467684	RESIDENT	LPCD3570	No	N/A. Protect greenfield sites	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
467711	RESIDENT	LPCD2271	0	The main priority is that it should enhance the area, not overload facilities, and leave us with attractive green spaces	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
469523	RESIDENT	LPCD2956	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development 0

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Sites
470045	RESIDENT	LPCD2176	0	All options ranked as 1	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
470778	RESIDENT	LPCD3647	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
470778	RESIDENT	LPCD3657	0	I am disappointed that you appear to be considering building upon every bit of green land around West Moor. There has already been a great deal of development in West Moor and any more could lead to a loss of community character and a less pleasant environment. There is already a high volume of traffic through West Moor which will be increased when the building at Lakeside is completed. I realise this sounds like a case of "not in my back yard" but can only suggest that brown sites should be developed first.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3362	Yes		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
472956	RESIDENT	LPCD2652	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
588147	RESIDENT	LPCD3320	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
795327	RESIDENT	LPCD1739	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Sites
795653	RESIDENT	LPCD1726	0	Plus access to green space	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
797142	RESIDENT	LPCD1751	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
797173	RESIDENT	LPCD1758	0	1. Close to public transport networks 1. Development densities in keeping with the local area 2. Financially capable of being developed	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
797201	RESIDENT	LPCD1764	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
797290	RESIDENT	LPCD1775	0	Empty flats (e.g. above shops etc) and discussed buildings be brought back into housing “ a variety of properties for all age groups.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
797322	RESIDENT	LPCD1781	0	Yes to: Provides a range of different types of housing Provides affordable housing Safe access to local amenities Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities Can provide appropriately sized gardens Can accommodate new business	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
797328	RESIDENT	LPCD1791	0	Both ticked: Close to places of work Can accommodate new businesses	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
797361	RESIDENT	LPCD1802	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
797382	RESIDENT	LPCD1825	0	Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) - 4 Close to places of work - 4 Close to public transport networks - 2 Provides a range of different types of housing - 1 Provides affordable housing - 1 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) - 1 Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities - 1 Financially capable of being developed - 1 Development densities in keeping with the local area - 1 Can provide appropriately-sized gardens - 3 Can accommodate new businesses - 3	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
797398	RESIDENT	LPCD1833	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
797412	RESIDENT	LPCD1838	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
797625	RESIDENT	LPCD1905	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
797625	RESIDENT	LPCD1910	0	Brown field sites should be used first to build. Affordable housing and employment, green belt, green open spaces should be left alone. Striking the right balance between growth and restraint.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
797776	RESIDENT	LPCD1951	0	Near to greenspace	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
798039	RESIDENT	LPCD2017	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
798041	RESIDENT	LPCD2018	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
798239	RESIDENT	LPCD2052	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
798299	RESIDENT	LPCD2062	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
798574	RESIDENT	LPCD2066	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
798687	RESIDENT	LPCD2123	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
798761	RESIDENT	LPCD2154	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
798782	RESIDENT	LPCD2159	0	8 also for 'close to public transport links networks' Priority (Council Houses needed)	S/7.3 Distribtion

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					of Potential Housing Development Sites
798995	RESIDENT	LPCD2199	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
800421	RESIDENT	LPCD2309	0	Given that West Park in West Monkseaton will join W.Monk with S Wellfield + Earsdon, do you intend to eradicate all the space between places. Eg Hazerigg to Wideopen top Brunswick Village + Green + Wideopen to Seaton Burn. No Break.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
800427	RESIDENT	LPCD2313	0	2 for 1. Above and Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas). 2 for 3. Above and Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities. 2 for 4. Above and Development densities in keeping with the local area.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
800431	RESIDENT	LPCD2324	0	We need new houses an green spaces. Derelict houses should either pulled down or made good, to use.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
800453	RESIDENT	LPCD2336	0	Other: Parking	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
800496	RESIDENT	LPCD2349	0	NA	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
800519	RESIDENT	LPCD2361	0	NA	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Housing Development Sites
800779	RESIDENT	LPCD2367	0	Preference 4: High speed internet	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
800789	RESIDENT	LPCD2371	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
801285	RESIDENT	LPCD2288	0	Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) - 1 Close to places of work - 5 Close to public transport networks - 2 Provides a range of different types of housing - 1 Provides affordable housing - 1 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) - 2 Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities - 3 Financially capable of being developed - 1 Development densities in keeping with the local area - 2 Can provide appropriately-sized gardens - 3 Can accommodate new businesses - 3	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
801572	RESIDENT	LPCD2410	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
803420	RESIDENT	LPCD2443	0	Traffic congestion	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
803466	RESIDENT	LPCD2456	0	Respondent ticked the following three boxes; Close to facilities, Close to public transport networks, Safe access to amenities.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
803503	RESIDENT	LPCD2461	In part	No response	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Housing Development Sites
803506	RESIDENT	LPCD2470	0	Respondent gave 1 to close to facilities, provides a range of different types of housing, provides affordable housing and financially capable of being developed. Added a note to say that costing/financial provision is very important. Gave 2 to close to public transport networks, safe access to local amenities. Gave 3 to development densities in keeping with the local area and can accommodate new businesses. Gave 5 to- can bring improvements to quality and range of local facilities. Gave 6 to both close to places of work and can provide appropriately-sized gardens.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
803722	RESIDENT	LPCD2500	0	More spacious houses for people who are happy to pay extra but have bigger rooms, especially 3rd bedroom	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
803835	RESIDENT	LPCD2534	No	Concerned that there are proposals to build on green field sites, while allowing former buildings like the former swimming baths, former Police Station etc... are allowed to stand empty and undeveloped.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
804918	RESIDENT	LPCD2925	0		0
804927	RESIDENT	LPCD2929	0		0
804944	RESIDENT	LPCD2935	0	1. Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) 1.Provides affordable housing 1. Development densities in keeping with the local area 2. Close to places of work 2. Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) 3. Close to public transport networks 4. Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities 4. Financially capable of being developed 4. Can provide appropriately - sized gardens 5. Can accomodate new businesses 9. Provides a range of different types of houses Other: Quality buildings that will last and not look run down and decrepit after 10 years.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
804998	RESIDENT	LPCD2965	0		0
					S/7.3 Distribution

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					of Potential Housing Development Sites
805010	RESIDENT	LPCD2980	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805051	RESIDENT	LPCD3061	0	NOT ON GREEN BELT AT ALL.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805053	RESIDENT	LPCD3098	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805060	RESIDENT	LPCD3111	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805078	RESIDENT	LPCD3167	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805085	RESIDENT	LPCD3202	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805172	RESIDENT	LPCD3252	0	Areas to be developed should have good access to major roads and not increase road traffic on existing minor roads and residential streets	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Housing Development Sites
805216	RESIDENT	LPCD3265	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805237	RESIDENT	LPCD3281	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805242	RESIDENT	LPCD3295	0	Will not add to traffic queues or overburden local schools/doctors	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805248	RESIDENT	LPCD3305	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805252	RESIDENT	LPCD3313	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
457989	RESIDENT	LPCD5066	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
464488	RESIDENT	LPCD5474	0	some preferences received multiple selections: Preference 1 also had 'Provide a range of different types of housing'; 'Provide affordable housing' and 'financially capable of being developed' selected. Preference 2 also had 'can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities' Preference 3	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				also had 'can accommodate new business' as a selection.	Development Sites
466886	RESIDENT	LPCD3957	No	I looked with horror at the map of the plan - how many open fields and green spaces that are marked up as possible sites for development. I understand the need for housing and jobs but there are many brown field sites about North Tyneside that could be redeveloped without the need for so many greenfield sites to be bulldozed. I live in West Moor and we have already lost a much loved green space to a future housing development which will cause traffic chaos and change the character of the area - and from the map NTC seem intent on more of the same. Please listen to local residents on their thoughts - people love their green spaces for walking and leisure and wildlife environments need support - birds and animals need more than "wildlife corridors" between remaining green pockets of land not swallowed up by developers.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
466979	RESIDENT	LPCD5070	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
467876	RESIDENT	LPCD4843	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
469684	RESIDENT	LPCD5720	0	First Preference - Adequate roads first to cope with increased traffic Second Preference - Adequate flood prevention	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
471031	RESIDENT	LPCD6174	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
471121	RESIDENT	LPCD5060	0	Jobs for unemployed North Tyneside residents must be first priority	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
471296	RESIDENT	LPCD5588	0	Other - use of existing sites first.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
589055	RESIDENT	LPCD6043	0	Provide road network for future use and adequate drainage infrastructure in keeping with proposed development.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
594617	RESIDENT	LPCD5917	0	Other - how "happy" does an area make its residents - less controlled and built up	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
803337	RESIDENT	LPCD5441	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
805252	RESIDENT	LPCD3314	0	There should be no sites developed on.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
805257	RESIDENT	LPCD3317	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
805265	RESIDENT	LPCD3335	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
805268	RESIDENT	LPCD3344	0		S/7.3 Distribtion 0

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					of Potential Housing Development Sites
805343	RESIDENT	LPCD3480	0	Preference 1 - Does not use greenfield sites	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805381	RESIDENT	LPCD3588	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805396	RESIDENT	LPCD3613	0	The Council should focus on developing affordable housing for the population. There are too many empty office sites in the Borough and too many large housing developments with too expensive houses. The infrastructure struggles to cope now with traffic being a huge problem. The green spaces and wildlife are being destroyed.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805428	RESIDENT	LPCD3655	0	Various options selected as first priority - Bungalows Close to public transport networks Provides a range of different types of housing Provides affordable housing Safe access to local amenities Can bring improvements to quality and range of local facilities Finacially capable of being developed Can provide appropriately sized gardens	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
806212	RESIDENT	LPCD4341	0	I also believe that it is inappropriate to use greenfield sites, and believe that Brownfield sites should be cleaned up for housing purposes. This leads to far less sprawl, unnecessary transport, and less carbon emissions, and makes sense for an integrated policy with combined objectives across housing, environmental, farming and quality of life objectives.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807156	RESIDENT	LPCD4832	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807162	RESIDENT	LPCD4839	0	Consultation Draft No further building on the few greenfield sites left at the Coast/North Shields and Wallsend. The coast infrastructure cannot support more housing as the roads cannot cope with	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				existing traffic. As a general principle all brownfield sites should be developed if necessary before any consideration is given to greenfield sites.	Housing Development Sites
807169	RESIDENT	LPCD4847	0	NA	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807188	RESIDENT	LPCD4871	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807206	RESIDENT	LPCD4902	0	I would like to strongly object to the draft local housing plan involving my area which is already suffering from traffic overload with three schools - two for primary school children and one for handicapped (surely a high priority). We have a local bus which struggles to get through the traffic as it is and which is a boon to elderly people like me needing to get to the post office and Sainsbury's When we moved to this area seventeen years ago we had no idea that Seatonville Road was so busy. We now have an additional housing estate plus two blocks of flats feeding on to it. This cannot we enjoy out green fields and allow our children to do the same. Goodness knows we are leaving them more than enough of our messed up world.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807291	RESIDENT	LPCD4972	0	Alternative preferences also selected: 2nd Preference - Finacially capable of being developed 4th Preference - Close to places of work, Provides affordable housing, Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities 9th Preference - development densities in keeping with the local area	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807315	RESIDENT	LPCD4987	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807330	RESIDENT	LPCD4998	0	Off road and footpath parking Keep off green belt and open space There seem to be too many boarded up houses in the area and undesirable areas to live. Address these problems.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
807414	RESIDENT	LPCD5021	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
807446	RESIDENT	LPCD5058	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
807544	RESIDENT	LPCD5079	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
807743	RESIDENT	LPCD5102	0	1. Unused land or largely unused land 2. A site not adding to flood problems and not pushing road junctions beyond capacity	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
807758	RESIDENT	LPCD5132	0	Other options selected as the first option are - Development densities in keeping with the local area & can provide appropriately-sized gardens	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
807779	RESIDENT	LPCD5167	0	Does not use green field sites.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
807790	RESIDENT	LPCD5181	0	Use of Brownfield sites first. Who/what has supplied these population/employment evidence based requirements? “ What evidence? Is immigration into the UK and all local authorities being anticipated here? I consider North Tyneside sufficiently “built up” already “ evidence traffic congestion at peak times e.g. Silverlink/Holystone (including the exit from Cobalt! etc.) Grid lock. If any development is required brownfield sites should be used first. We need to protect our green spaces and sporting facilities, sports fields etc To encourage a fit and healthy society (I recall back to late	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				70% when North Tyneside Council sold off numerous sports fields for housing) UK has one of Western Europe's highest obesity levels already.	
807799	RESIDENT	LPCD5185	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807810	RESIDENT	LPCD5190	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807825	RESIDENT	LPCD5208	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807842	RESIDENT	LPCD5224	0	The disappointment is that the majority of new homes which it is proposed should be built in Monkseaton South Ward will be on greenfield land. Are there no brownfield sites available?	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807899	RESIDENT	LPCD5243	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807900	RESIDENT	LPCD5244	0	In general, I would prefer the Council to redevelop urban wasteland rather than start new developments on green field sites.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807951	RESIDENT	LPCD5316	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Sites
808018	RESIDENT	LPCD5347	0	1. Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) 1. Close to public transport networks 3. Provides a range of different types of housing 3. Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) 3. Can provide appropriately-sized gardens 4. Provides affordable housing 4. Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities 4. Development densities in keeping with the local area 4. Can accommodate new businesses 5. Close to places of work] 7. Financially capable of being developed	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808047	RESIDENT	LPCD5373	0		0 S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808086	RESIDENT	LPCD5415	0		0 S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808091	RESIDENT	LPCD5423	0		0 S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808108	RESIDENT	LPCD5442	0	I think we should be building on land which is currently derelict, not encroaching on green land.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808138	RESIDENT	LPCD5480	0	Multiple selection for some preferences - additional selections below: Preference 3 - 'Can provide appropriately sized gardens' Preference 7- 'Financially capable of being developed'	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808139	RESIDENT	LPCD5496	0	It is possible to open up the Murton/Shiremoor area to housing “ though access to area will require new highways as the existing access roads to area are third rate as it is. A new Metro station would be required. Large open spaces are required through out the Borough and not only along the Northern boundary. As urban sprawl does nothing for communities that are often swallowed up in their ever onward progress. As I have stated the highways around many of your potential development sites will	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				not cope with the increase of motor cars and heavy vehicles that will severely congest the said highways.	
808157	RESIDENT	LPCD5499	No	Use of more brown sites i.e. with planning permission alongside existing housing	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
808173	RESIDENT	LPCD5533	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
808189	RESIDENT	LPCD5558	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
808201	RESIDENT	LPCD5571	0	Other prefences selceted for different options; Preference 5 - Can accommodate new businesses was also selected. Preference 11 - Provides a range of different types of housing, Provides affordable housing, Safe access to amenities	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
808309	RESIDENT	LPCD5669	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
808349	RESIDENT	LPCD5691	0	Conserve local heritage and ecology.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
808354	RESIDENT	LPCD5689	0	None You are destroying the countryside and quality of life.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Sites
808372	RESIDENT	LPCD5694	0	8. Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) 10. Development densities in keeping with the local area 10. Can provide appropriately-sized gardens.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808506	RESIDENT	LPCD5752	0	Yes we need houses but don't go mad. Please leave us some green fields.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808545	RESIDENT	LPCD5761	0	1. Financially capable of being developed 1. Development densities in keeping with the local area 2. Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) 2. Close to public transport networks 2. Provides a range of different types of housing 3. Safe access to local play areas 5. Close to places of work 5. Can provide appropriately-sized gardens 5. Can accommodate new business 6. Provides affordable housing Other: Ensure open areas and some individuality through not joining up all villages/towns.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808570	RESIDENT	LPCD5773	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808597	RESIDENT	LPCD5802	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808615	RESIDENT	LPCD5820	0	1. Close to public transport networks 1. Financially capable of being developed 1. Development densities in keeping with the local area 2. Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) 3. Provides a range of different types of housing 3. Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) 4. Close to places of work 4. Can provide appropriately-sized gardens 5. Provides affordable housing 6. Can accommodate new businesses 8. Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities Other: Leave open spaces	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808629	RESIDENT	LPCD5831	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Sites
808638	RESIDENT	LPCD5848	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808662	RESIDENT	LPCD5882	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808699	RESIDENT	LPCD5899	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808714	RESIDENT	LPCD5907	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808797	RESIDENT	LPCD5947	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
809054	RESIDENT	LPCD6100	0	The questions at section 3 of the document are virtually uncollatable; if a real intent to involve the public in meaningful dialogue was intended, this would have been constructed differently. You have experts in the field, I hope, and they are employed to make these decisions with their specialist knowledge.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
809117	RESIDENT	LPCD6253	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
809130	RESIDENT	LPCD6270	0	Other: Not too close to other houses.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
809133	RESIDENT	LPCD6283	0	Your plans are sheer 'madness'	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
451166	0	LPCD245	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
631932	0	LPCD281	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
0	0	LPCD672	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
792975	0	LPCD530	0	Highlighted for priority: Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) Close to place of work Close to public transport networks	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
0	0	LPCD1536	0		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites 0
793701	0	LPCD926	In part	I agree with the policy in principle, but feel further confirmation of how the development sites within	S/7.3 Distribtion

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				the main urban area are to be allocated. i do not feel for example it would be appropriate for all the development to be placed within one particular part or location within the main urban area. the 10,671 houses should be spread out with the area, helping to maintain and enhance areas across the borough and keeping individual areas from being overdeveloped. For example the areas to the north of Palmersville/Holystone or around Murton village should only be part developed so as not to lose all of the green space which currently exists.	of Potential Housing Development Sites
0	0	LPCD1742	In part	All options ticked without preference except: Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas), and Financially capable of being developed.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
0	0	LPCD2077	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
458324	0	LPCD2138	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
463341	0	LPCD3493	0	My first concern is over the number of sectors within the North West part of the borough for both house building and employment and nothing to the same extent for the coastal areas of Whitley Bay / Tynemouth. Although it is recognised that new houses are needed, we have had one or two very large developments recently, and another is already planned. I would not agree to any of the development within West Moor. Development of all the sites recognised would leave West Moor with no green spaces and would make us a suburb of Newcastle. Also developed, but which I cannot see on the plan is the area where the old Norgas House once stood beside Killingworth Lake or the land on the opposite side of the road where I believe a new care home is to be built as well as houses.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
590531	0	LPCD2218	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
591698	0	LPCD3119	0	Following qualities selected but not ranked: Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) Close to places of work Close to public transport networks Provides a range of different types of housing Provides	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				affordable housing Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) Financially capable of being developed Can provide appropriately sized gardens	Housing Development Sites
594633	0	LPCD2108	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
638474	0	LPCD2035	0	Pedestrian access to be separate to car access	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
793117	0	LPCD2334	0	NA	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
798722	0	LPCD2147	No	Too many greenfield sites are proposed around the Murton/New York/Monkseaton area (sites 40/41) potentially losing much current greenbelt. The area containing the Whitley Bay Football/Cricket grounds (site 47) is also of great concern - not to mention the future of the Hillheads allotments.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
803493	0	LPCD2814	In part	North Tyneside should initially be concentrating on encouraging the utilisation of its existing brown field and available in-fill sites for housing development. Developments should include a mix of housing types including affordable housing. Sites should be being released on an incremental basis to meet new housing development requirements, thus minimising the need for extensive and unnecessary new infrastructure facilities. The release of the few remaining existing green field sites in North Tyneside for new housing should be minimised and avoided where possible so as to retain the existing character of the Borough and its environmental value to the wider region. Building on the greenfield sites east of the A19, (sites 35-41) and east of Killingworth, (sites 22-26) should only be carried out as a last resort if required and then only towards the end of the 15 year planning period.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
804025	0	LPCD2622	No	Fairhurst recognise that Policy S/7.3 "Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites" of the Local Plan Consultation Draft identifies that the selection of a preferred range of housing sites to meet identified needs will be informed by the following: a) The sustainability appraisal of each site; b) Evidence of the suitability, availability and overall economic viability of the sites for delivery taking into	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>account the constraints affecting potential development sites and the potential for delivery to mitigate any impacts - including biodiversity, sustainable access and highways, flood risk and heritage assets; c) Where alternative uses might be appropriate the overall requirements and suitability of sites for that use; and d) The evidence provided by responses through this Local Plan Consultation Draft. In response to the above criteria, Fairhurst wish to highlight the following points: “ Fairhurst have requested that the sustainability of the development of the site for housing is considered by NTC. It should be noted that the site is located adjacent to an existing built up area and there are existing bus stops on the A192 which are served by regular bus services; “ Fairhurst consider that the site is suitable for housing. Fairhurst, on behalf of Mr Watson, can confirm that the site is available for housing development. Additionally, it is considered that green field housing development in this location is likely to be attractive to the market and viable; “ Any future planning application for the development of the site would be accompanied by a Phase 1 Habitat Survey. However, further information could be provided in advance of this to inform the evidence base of the emerging Local Plan, should this be considered necessary by NTC; “ Fairhurst consider that there are a number of potential vehicular access solutions. Vehicular access could be potentially taken from either the A192 or Hartley Lane. Further information demonstrating the deliverability of access could be provided to NTC, should this be required; “ Fairhurst note that a future planning application for the residential development of the site would be expected to be accompanied by a Transport Statement / Transport Assessment and potentially a Travel Plan; “ On the Environment Agency’s flood risk maps, a very small area of the site is identified as “low” risk for surface water flooding. The remainder of the site is identified as “very low” risk for surface water flooding. Fairhurst consider that an appropriate foul and surface water drainage solution could be designed to ensure that the sustainable development of the site meets the requirements of the NPPF Technical Guidance; “ Fairhurst note that there are no designated heritage assets within close proximity to the site. It is expected that any future planning application for the residential development of the site would be accompanied by an Archaeological Assessment and Heritage Statement, if necessary; and “ Fairhurst consider that the development of the site could support and enhance facilities and services at Earsden and other nearby settlements such as Shiremoor.</p>	Sites
804850	0	LPCD2785	No	<p>Any new housing must be built on the A19/A189 corridor. No housing should be built between Monkseaton and Shiremoor. This area of land should be returned to green belt. Open space is vitally important for the well-being of existing residents. Building on this land will increase flood risk. The local road network in the Monkseaton area is already overburdened.</p>	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805211	0	LPCD3788	In part	<p>Point S/7.3 should include more rigorous criteria around the protection of sites which are valuable to wildlife. Selection of a range of housing sites should only proceed where it can be ensured that as little damage - or no damage at all - as possible takes is done to the borough's wildlife habitats.</p>	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Development Sites
0	0	LPCD5222	0	Covering our fields with houses is not the answer, pull old empty buildings down.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
458476	0	LPCD3996	No	<p>I continue to be concerned at the willingness of NTC to be complicit in the development of green field sites as opposed to the re-development of brown field sites. In future years our children and our children's children will not know the joy of looking at an agricultural field or of seeing wildlife in a natural habitat. All green fields will be concreted over and ugly housing developments will replace nature at its best. So brown field sites should always be built on first, even if it DOES eat into builders profits.. If there remains a need to develop green field sites, then this needs to be done in the context of site sustainability, along with recent / current developments. There has been far too much focus on areas around the Rising Sun Country Park which were never sustainable, along with West Moor. This will cause irreversible damage to wildlife and total destruction of major wildlife corridors and should never have been in the previous plan. At the time the previous plan (Core Strategy Proposal Document) was published, the area identified as being the most sustainable in the borough for housing development was the area around Murton yet for some reason (which we all knew) this area was dropped from the final Core Strategy document on the grounds that "residents might object". Clearly the residents of Murton would not be happy and do not wish to shoulder their share of developments in the borough but it IS the most sustainable green field site in North Tyneside, as identified by the Council's own officers. It adjoins a new dualled road system linking it to the A19. It also has a Metro line running through it and a new station could be built in the middle of the site to reduce the need for road transport. It also has significant school places available close by, particularly in the Secondary sector at Monkseaton High School. It is not public access land, so there is no real loss of civic amenity. This will probably sound like I'm throwing Murton to the wolves, yet Murton has been quite happy to throw those of us living in close proximity to Station Road North to the wolves. Please, please encourage developers to use brown field sites first (you will find that Persimmon already own a number of brownfield sites but are loathe to spend any money on cleaning up these sites prior to re-development. No profit in it! Can the government not be called upon to provide incentives such that building on brownfield sites will become profitable for greedy developers (and greedy councils)? However, if there is a need for green field sites to be utilised then Murton has to be the first one to be developed.</p>	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
588681	0	LPCD6256	0	Over the years I have seen more and more development around Monkseaton and the area between Monkseaton and Earsdon is now being closed up. I see in the Consultation that there is mention of	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>provision being made for a gap between . Monkseaton and Shiremoor. This gap is essential. Without it the coastal area will just be an extension of Newcastle. Looking at the map of Monkseaton and Whitley Bay it appears that the only green areas appear to be school playing fields, cemeteries plus Tynemouth Golf Club and, of course, the precious Links. The Green Belt area to the north has been encroached on with the building of Red House Farm. Earsdon is set to lose it's village status with the further development opposite Wellfield of 4 and 5 bedroom 'executive homes'. This will ensure that the homeless executives currently living out on the street in Tyneside will be provided with housing. I remember as a child growing up in the 1960s Monkseaton being surrounded by farmland, we used to go on cross country runs from Whitley Bay Grammar School, along past Red House Farm. Our garden, in Cauldwell Lane, was always inhabited by lots of birds, blackbirds, sparrows, robins, blue tits, greenfinches, thrushes, starlings. The area that I am really worried about is the area around Murton Village. It is this area that one sees as the break between Newcastle and the Coast when travelling on the metro and it provides a restful green oasis when travelling to and from work. This area has already been encroached on in West Monkseaton and at Rake Lane and it would be a tragedy if this area was built up, once built on, lost forever. The area contains one of the last farms on Tynes ide (although sadly now converted to business premises). I think it would be a splendid idea to retain this area as farmland and convert it to a Community farm area where people can form a 'co-operative' to grow crops, rear pigs, chickens (free range) and provide stabling for horses - maybe some of this could be on a co-operative basis too so that people can have access to horses when they cannot afford to keep their own. Also it could be a learning stop for local school children who can learn about agriculture, animal welfare and environment. It would also provide employment. There could be an allotment area. This area joins up with the area around Earsdon which is a haven for horses. I understand that the area between Earsdon and West Hollywell consists of old mine works and so is unsuitable for development (convenient that it is classified as green belt?) There are some eye sores around here, notably the old pit buildings, why have these not been demolished? I was informed by a former Mayor that this area was going to be developed as a country park but not much seems to have been done. I am sure this was because of our proximity to farmland although another factor was probably that more people took an interest in their gardens rather than paving them over. Now my old garden is empty, just the occasional Wood Pigeon, all the birds have gone. There also appear to be numerous small areas in North Shields (I cannot identify these areas) that may be suitable for retail or housing.</p>	Housing Development Sites
591119	0	LPCD5278	0	Brownfield sites	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
804541	0	LPCD5088	0		0 S/7.3 Distribtion

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					of Potential Housing Development Sites
805402	0	LPCD3824	In part	I am particularly interested in areas 35 to 41 (around Murton). I would not objected to all development in this area. I feel that some development might be appropriate if it could be well interspersed with many wooded and green open areas. The other most important aspect for this area is to get the road access provision right. There needs to be two main roads, one from the A186 Shiremoor/ Earsdon main road and the other from the A191 New York road near the Borders shop, both linking together somewhere centrally and joining up with the end of Cauldwell Avenue to provide an additional traffic entry/exit for Whitley Bay. This additional entry/exit is needed to ease the major traffic congestion experienced every morning and evening on Whitley Bay's Earsdon Road with Seatonville Road.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
805403	0	LPCD3724	In part		S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
805479	0	LPCD4514	No	What is obvious is that the if the areas identified on the plan were all developed the result would be unsustainable urban spawl leading to cultural isolation and environmental and social degredation. It is an unsustainable and unworkable plan. Also developement should be holistic (see Dutch/scandinavian models) with employment, recreational facilities, schools and retails facilities developed together along with sustainable transport networks, for example, cycle routes prioritised over cars. But with integrated developement work should be near to home and you could get a coffee on the way....	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
805498	0	LPCD3751	No	I strongly object to this document. There are areas of land identified for future development around Monkseaton/Wellfield/Earsdon/Murton village which are ridiculous over development proposals. The traffic in these areas both in the morning and evenings is excessive and these proposals will only make matters worse - we will see clear evidence of this when the ill thought out housing development across form Wellfield starts getting occupied in the coming months. proposals around Killingworth on existing farmland are totally ridiculous and ill thought out as well, there will be no open space left in the borough and its unique qualities will be lost for ever. We are already seeing far too much housing development in the borough as it is, with even more proposed around Backworth which will ruin the village quality for ever and rob the borough of yet more open space, open space is being swallowed up at an alarming rate and this must be stopped before its too late. There has been little or no consideration to the people to live, travel and work in this borough in this document - existing road networks and junctions cannot cope with existing levels of traffic let alone adding more to it.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
805504	0	LPCD6448	0	Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) - 4 Close to places of work - 10 Close to public transport	S/7.3 Distribtion

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				networks - 11 Provides a range of different types of housing - 4 Provides affordable housing - 6 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) - 8 Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities - 8 Financially capable of being developed - 8 Development densities in keeping with the local area - 10 Can provide appropriately-sized gardens - 10 Can accommodate new businesses - 9	of Potential Housing Development Sites
805508	0	LPCD4432	No	I object to the use of current greenfield sites as the definition of the 'village' communities will be lost. The Wildlife will also become constricted and eventually be extinct in the area as animals and birds and reptiles and insects need a wide area in which to breed and form communities. The wildlife feeding areas like Holystone, Firtree farm, East Benton Farm, and Killingworth Moor, High farm and the farmland around Murton are important. Many flocks of Sparrows, Rooks Crows, Finches and migratory birds like the skylark will not be seen. They lift our spirits on walks through our already meagre green space on and around the old waggon-ways. Also, any building on Killingworth Moor will, despite rainwater drains, cause run-off from paved areas and new roads to flood the houses in Palmersville. We already have a water-logging problem in Forest hall. Traffic will also be a problem, especially on Great Lime Road and Whitley Road, and roads linking the A1058 from Monkseaton and the Silverlink/Cobalt business parks. The land already being built over at Wideopen, Killingworth lake area, Shiremoor, Earsdon, Beaumont park West Monkseaton/Wellfied and West Moor Whitehouse farm. The effect of all these built sites should be looked at carefully to see if all houses are taken and how many older homes stand empty as a result. Question 2 Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) - 9 Close to places of work - 8 Close to public transport networks - 8 Provides a range of different types of housing - 7 Provides affordable housing - 7 Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) - 9 Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities - 7 Financially capable of being developed - 9 Development densities in keeping with the local area - 11 Can provide appropriately-sized gardens - 11 Can accommodate new businesses - 1	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805519	0	LPCD3799	No	I would like to object in general terms to the amount of development (with regards to new housing) being proposed, to built on green field sites within North Tyneside. I feel it's just far too much. Surely brown field sites should be considered first. We have already lost so much in the last 20 years I would hate to see even more go.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805553	0	LPCD3884	No	I realise that it is not intended to develop all these sites but even so the scale of potential development in North Tyneside is a daunting prospect, it seems that just about every green space is at risk and the area is in danger of losing some of its semi-rural character. There is too much development earmarked around the Rising Sun country park and Murton village is in danger of being lost to urban sprawl. As well as a loss to important green space these developments would create gridlock on the already congested roads in these areas.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805554	0	LPCD3891	In part	The above list to prioritise is flawed and narrow. There is no option to rank consideration for current	S/7.3 Distribution

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				residents in surrounding areas or sympathetic to surrounding area.	of Potential Housing Development Sites
805559	0	LPCD4501	No	Massive residential areas can only create more traffic congestion; surely it is better to provide areas with houses that are suitable for our ageing population, so they can move out of their family home into a local, purpose built smaller home; so freeing up many 3 bedroom houses, that are under occupied at the moment.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
805568	0	LPCD4509	No	As pointed out by the community there are over 4000 houses that have been granted planning permission in the borough but have yet to be started, maybe the council should be more proactive in pushing these through to completion rather than identifying new sites on green fields or work at only using brown field sites. Surely that would make more sense. There has been far too much development around the West Moor area. The road networks are already stretched to overcapacity and the map does not seem to have reflected the development going on now by the Lakeside in Killingworth / West Moor. I have lived in the area since the mid 1960's and there has been massive development with the 2 industrial estates, 3 housing estates not including White house Farm or the Lakeside. Will this development into a concrete jungle only end when there is no green spaces left?	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808055	0	LPCD5385	0	I am writing to object to the plan which is misconceived. It takes the short-term easy option of destroying the green belt instead of the longer term superior choice of restoring brownfield sites. It is very disappointing that the council seems to be reverting to the appalling destructive town planning of the 60s and 70s.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808166	0	LPCD5519	0	Not overload existing infrastructure. Allocations should allow for: i) retention of green space (as per previous policy of green corridors) between communities to enhance environment/setting and identify them, e.g. Killingworth, Wallsend, Northumberland Park/Shiremoor/Backworth, Earsdon where this is still possible, avoiding 22, 23, 24 and part 26. ii) development should have/pay for adequate infrastructure/road access and not be incremental/haphazard, overloading local facilities i.e. be part of an overall plan with schools, roads, space, services. iii) land should be allocated for employment on redeveloped sites and allocations allow for underuse of existing buildings which could take time to fill (EZs).	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808294	0	LPCD5644	0		S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
806099	0	LPCD4276	0	I write to express my concern about North Tyneside plans for a large housing development from Cramlington to the Gosforth Nature [originally submitted as Nuclear] Reserve. This will cut off the wild life corridors to the Nature Reserve. and will be disastrous. Please do not go ahead with this plan.	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites
795052	RESIDENT	LPCD1558	0	I thinknew houses should only be rented to those that can pay rent eg. working class on low incomes that cannot afford to buy or get on the property ladder, but still work!	7 Type of Housing Provision for a Diverse Borough
801285	RESIDENT	LPCD2290	0	I would like to see more 2 bedroom bungalows for older people near amenities & transport.	7 Type of Housing Provision for a Diverse Borough
444604	RESIDENT	LPCD3553	0	Please build more affordable housing between Monkseaton Drive and Earsdon, NOT the luxury houses planned. There are no Millionaires on the Council Housing Required List! There are many people paying the bedroom tax that would like smaller flats, I know some. A few of these refugees on low wages; Iâ€™ve worked with them in the past. P.S. WE HAVE ABOUT 800 PEOPLE NEEDING CHEAP COUNCIL TYPE HOUSING. MANY COST THE COUNCIL A LOT, FOR FAMILIES LIVING SEMI PERMINANTLY IN â€œBED & BREAKFASTSâ€œ, STUFF THE EMPRESS DOME, BUILD CHEAP HOUSING!	7 Type of Housing Provision for a Diverse Borough
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3365	0	overall i would like to see council houses built where the council is the landlord.	7 Type of Housing Provision for a Diverse Borough
792734	RESIDENT	LPCD487	0	Make sure site traffic dos not make the local area dangerous (in Annitsford 14 houses being built = 31 cars blocking the road + dangerous wagons etc - shocking mess and dangerous)	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3363	No	Proposing to build on site 47 a green area with 4 sports facilities on it goes against points you make about make through out this document about making the borough an attractive place to live. The mere suggestion of demolishing an ice-rink and building on the 3 green sports fields beside it should never have been entertained yet alone proposed on a public document.	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
805051	RESIDENT	LPCD3095	0	Concentrate on affordable homes in affordable areas, rather than areas where prices are going to be too high for anyone to afford.	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development
444718	RESIDENT	LPCD4267	In part	For housing, it would be best to try and obtain the needed capacity through higher density and more creative use of existing and brown field sites rather than using further greenfield ones.	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development
793701	0	LPCD927	Yes		DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development 0
796814	0	LPCD1743	In part	Problems with the potential sites numbered 35 to 41 on the draft local plan. Rake Lane is one of the existing roads accessing these sites. This road serves as the main access to the Hospital and is currently at capacity during rush hour. The thought of some of the proposed housing accessing this road at peak times worries me, especially if emergency vehicles are involved. I would suggest you look at building another bridge over the Metro line, connecting to Shiremoor Bypass, and use this to take some of the traffic away from the Hospital area. I am surprised you are not making use of the land to the north of this bypass, as it's capacity for traffic is much higher than the housing developments around Rake Lane. I also feel the loss of green space in this area would be detrimental to wildlife, though if done with new green corridors, and green buffers between housing areas would be acceptable. As you are proposing to develop on the existing Shiremoor allotments, could you not provide new allotments in this area too?	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development
805386	0	LPCD3648	In part	Any new developments which will have an impact on Earsdon Road, West Monkseaton would be a very negative move. This area is regularly at a standstill. If any of the plots 35 - 41 are to be used, consider using land away from this area. With A&E moving from the hospital land opposite might be a more appropriate and manageable option.	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development
805211	0	LPCD3753	In part	Policy DM/7.4 should be amended to include more specific criteria in relation to the conservation and creation of new wildlife habitats in and around new housing development, such as green corridors and buffer zones. "Green infrastructure" is too vague a term and whilst a new children's play park is an obvious necessity in any new development, the provision of green spaces must also include areas which have some value to wildlife (preferably adequate to preserve or even enhance the wildlife existing on those sites).	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development
590131	RESIDENT	LPCD1102	No	Building houses for people who cannot afford the upkeep can only make things worse.	DM/7.5 Affordable

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Housing
793926	RESIDENT	LPCD1126	In part	I would prefer housing that was owned by the L.A. or rented in some way, who can afford a mortgage in the current financial climate???	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
794119	RESIDENT	LPCD1260	In part	Whilst providing affordable housing is very important the amenities should be of a very high standard	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
798687	RESIDENT	LPCD2131	0	I am an ex Colliery Mining Engineer and still proud of it. Having been employed at Burradon and Rising Sun Colliery's. But I believe our villages Burradon Dudley Seaton Burn are still tarnished with the colliery village image, we should now leave this image behind and try and improve our villages with a mix of superior private dwellings & high standard affordable housing to try to catch up!!	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
471121	RESIDENT	LPCD5063	0	Affordable housing must be exactly what it says i.e. affordable for someone on minimum wage	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
807096	RESIDENT	LPCD4785	In part	“Support new council housing delivery with 25% of all new homes being affordable” Mixing “new council housing” with 25% “affordable” suggests that 25% of new homes will be affordable council houses. Is this what you meant ? Why else would it appear in the same sentence ? What exactly do you mean by “support” and “delivery” ? There has to be “affordable” housing “!.. affordable for who ? How affordable ? The Council knows better than I do that housing and house prices are a major national issue, catastrophe even. Thanks for the consultation but try to tell it like it is. Home owners (majority) = voters so no big changes to housing policy. I’m sure you know that 100% of housing is affordable to somebody and that those least able to afford should receive more help than communities are currently allowed to offer.	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
807150	RESIDENT	LPCD4821	0	I would also like to see clear planning in relation to affordable housing. We have seen a lot of development in recent years but the majority of homes seem to be for those already on the housing ladder. The current development at Earsdon for example - does it include any smaller units?	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
807842	RESIDENT	LPCD5227	0	The quoted lower number of [homes] between 10,500 and 12,000 does seem reasonable. Such development MUST include a proportion of affordable homes and the proposed figure of one quarter is a starting point but is it not possible to increase this? Also affordable must mean exactly what it implies - reasonably priced so that young people can get a foot on the property ladder.	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
803493	0	LPCD2815	In part	The location for the affordable housing needs to be managed through the Plan. Extremes in housing value should not be in close proximity to each other. Some in-fill sites are suitable for affordable housing and it should be the responsibility of developers constructing market properties elsewhere in the Borough to be building their required affordable housing at the same time on the sites selected by the planning authorities.	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3366	Yes		S/7.6 Delivering New Council Homes 0
792978	RESIDENT	LPCD549	0	More flats for single people.	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
793403	RESIDENT	LPCD720	0	I would advise that the houses to be built (maybe) are not so small as a lot of new ones area, hardly space to swing a mouse let alone a cat, couples move in along comes a family and straight away the house is to small and that is half the present trouble, the builders try to cram to many and almost within 3 yrs the area has started to look delapidated. Houses yes boxes no.	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
396802	RESIDENT	LPCD790	0	More housing needed but of smaller properties	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
794119	RESIDENT	LPCD1261	No	Rather than building detached houses with tiny gardens greater use should be made of town houses without gardens. This would go some way to maintain the quality of developments where land values are high.	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
793701	0	LPCD928	No	I don't feel it should be specified exactly what make up of housing types should be provided on any site at his stage. it should be decdiied on a siste by site basis depending on the latest evidence of housing needs (ilcudin gin that particualr sub-area or part of the borough) and the market viability of the site. I do agree that each site should however have a mix of different housing types.	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
805386	0	LPCD3650	No	40% of new housing to be built should be 4 + bedrooms is difficult to understand. With increasing fuel bills for heating, and with low economic growth this is of concern.	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
805479	0	LPCD4515	No	I accept that some developement is needed. First time homes, one and two bedroom flats, maisonettes and even a few 3 bed homes for young families, but the way this is delivered needs to be re-thought. Detatched houses are less energy efficient than terraces. It's science, greater surface area etc.	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
					7.8
805386	0	LPCD3651	In part	Yes houses like this are needed but not 40% of the new stock to be built.	DM/7.9 Large Executive Housing
808938	RESIDENT	LPCD6084	0	We note the comments regarding Houses in Multiple Occupation. While they can serve a purpose in specific areas, we believe that all such conversions should be the subject of a Planning Application. This will ensure that the residents are able to have their say on the proposals and that the obligations of	DM/7.10 Houses in Multiple

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				the Developer to the local community are met.	Occupation
					7.11
803493	0	roykilborn @btinterne t.com	LPCD28 16	In part	AS/7.12 Residential Institutions
792219	0	LPCD278	No	every single member of the borough knows this proposed draft for development is ludicrous, as a council you can't manage what you have already, Its took years and years to do the dome and at what purpose, Whitley bay is nothing more than charity shops and estate agents, on a ground level people know the plase is dead and for a fair night out every one goes to Tynemouth. why am I telling you this you all know the facts. sustain and improve what you have and get your heads out of the clouds, The employment status within the borough will not sustain the proposal for new housing, its a figment of the coalition governments imagination this will happen, its time for counselors to look around on a daily basis and to get out of there ivory towers and sort out the issues of today not to cover the borough in concrete which I may add where would all the water end up OOH yes above ground as the drainage systems are shot as we all now. get a grip and sort the issues out for today and tomorrow. who would have thought Whitley Bay was once the jewel in the crown of the borough. Lastly in your wisdom you set up business in the Cobolt park. is this a move to only allow people limited access to you, because as I see it Mrs Bloggs of 80 years down the street who has no car limited public transport services is really going to cherish popping in to see the council and as for the council site in Whitley Bay thats some ivory tower and with a double yellow line mote all the way around it, and no parking to boot. As I said sort the things that matter to us all at grass root level.	S/7.13 Protecting the Quality of Existing Housing Stock
793893	RESIDENT	LPCD1098	0	There is a lot of empty housing stock. Why don't you develop that?	S/7.13 Protecting the Quality of Existing Housing Stock
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3367	Yes		S/7.13 Protecting the Quality of Existing Housing Stock
803493	0	LPCD2817	In part	You state that "the Council will work to ensure residential areas remain healthy, safe, attractive and	S/7.13

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				sustainable". I fully agree with this, but it means that you will also have to work on maintaining and improving the pavements, roads, verges and street lighting etc. You should therefore have mentioned this in your detail rather than concentrating your reference on efforts on energy efficiency etc.	Protecting the Quality of Existing Housing Stock
805386	0	LPCD3652	In part	Bringing long term empty homes back in to use is crucial to meeting future housing stock need.	S/7.13 Protecting the Quality of Existing Housing Stock
807150	RESIDENT	LPCD4822	0	What opportunities are there for revitalising and improving current housing? We also need affordable rental accommodation as council stock is sadly depleted.	S/7.13 Protecting the Quality of Existing Housing Stock
797110	0	LPCD2749	Yes		DM/7.14 Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople 0
536770	RESIDENT	LPCD6644	No	Mr & Mrs McConnell are both concerned that the recent consultation document(s) published by the Council says they will give consideration to a Travellers/Gypsy site in the Borough. They don't believe the Council should even consider this possibility.	DM/7.14 Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
789782	RESIDENT	LPCD17	0	More allotments please.	8 Green Infrastructure
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2750	0	As a Greenist I am very aware of the amount of cosmetic greenness that is around. It is important that trueGreenism is applied to this section.	8 Green Infrastructure
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3368	0	If you were really concerned about green infrastructure you would not have allowed a proposal to build on an ice rink and 3 sports pitches to see the light of day. I am referring to site 47. It also is adjacent to	8 Green Infrastructure

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				Marden Quarry Nature Reserve and MArden Meadow. So the proposed building would block the wildlife corridor.	
804850	RESIDENT	LPCD2796	0	If NTC are interested in Green infrastructure then the area between Shiremoor and Monkseaton should be returned to green belt?	8 Green Infrastructure
805358	RESIDENT	LPCD3586	0	Do you have an active policy and mechanism for working with local farmers to sustain viable agricultural activity? Do you think about things like supporting and developing small holdings, with fruit and vegetable growing and small scale and specialist agriculture that creates employment? North Tyneside should see land as an asset in these respects, not just as something that lies fallow till someone pays enough to build on it.	8 Green Infrastructure
805535	RESIDENT	LPCD4472	0	L.D.P ref 8.59.-states "North Tyneside has several derelict industrial sites due to its industrial heritage, there are substantial residual areas which require treatment, for example along Riverside". Many brown field sites exist all across North Tyneside-empty factories/offices, retail & business units-warehouses etc. We have adequate brown field sites to meet the requirements for new homes for the next 15 years.We should be preserving the good grade agricultural land for food production, the leisure & quality of life & good image that this gives North Tyneside-to all potential investors, residents & the tourism which is worth "240 million pounds to the local economy".	8 Green Infrastructure
792532	RESIDENT	LPCD384	0	We do need to provide more green spaces e.g. Rising Sun Country Park.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
797412	RESIDENT	LPCD1949	Yes	I would suggest tree planting and landscaping in some of the green space locations rather than than just vacant green space and maybe some use for leisure activities.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
806899	RESIDENT	LPCD4668	0	You should bear in mind the legacy of allowing green spaces around existing housing which will be important for our (and your) children. Do not betray them or us and always remember that it is the residents who pay your wages.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
806968	RESIDENT	LPCD4672	0	You should bear in mind the legacy of allowing green spaces around existing housing which will be important for our (and your) children. Do not betray them or us and always remember that it is the residents who pay your wages.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
806971	RESIDENT	LPCD4676	0	You should bear in mind the legacy of allowing green spaces around existing housing which will be important for our (and your) children. Do not betray them or us and always remember that it is the residents who pay your wages.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
806977	RESIDENT	LPCD4680	0	You should bear in mind the legacy of allowing green spaces around existing housing which will be important for our (and your) children. Do not betray them or us and always remember that it is the residents who pay your wages.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
808652	RESIDENT	LPCD5895	0	Green spaces improve peoples feeling of well being and encourage exercise.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
793701	0	LPCD929	Yes	I agree, Green Infrastructure should be taken as seriously as built infrastructure in the planning of the Borough	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
803493	0	LPCD2818	Yes	The remaining green infrastructure is an important asset of the Borough and also provides value to the adjoining areas of Newcastle, South East Northumberland and the wider community. We should therefore be trying to retain and develop the green infrastructure in the Borough where we can. It is therefore important that we try to avoid building on any of the remaining green infrastructure and preferably encourage developments on existing brown field and infill sites.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
592444	0	LPCD3597	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Sustainability: Open green space should be protected for residents who use these for recreational pursuits including cycling, walking, horse riding, running, bird watching, rambling, and dog walking. This should be safeguarded and kept available for the community in years to come. Not become a concrete jungle. Open space also has benefits on health and well being, whereby people can enjoy some peace and quiet in a natural urban break, an all too important point when taking into consideration the busy lives of many people and their families.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
592447	0	LPCD3624	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Sustainability: Open green space should be protected for residents who use these for recreational pursuits including cycling, walking, horse riding, running, bird watching, rambling, and dog walking. This should be safeguarded and kept available for the community in years to come. Not become a concrete jungle. Open space also has benefits on health and well being, whereby people can enjoy some peace and quiet in a natural urban break, an all too important point when taking into consideration the busy lives of many people and their families.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
805211	0	LPCD3789	In part	Point S/8.1 is too vague a statement. The statement itself should define what "green infrastructure" actually is to ensure that this policy is not circumvented when the Plan comes into effect. It is likely that this policy is contradictory to other policies in the Plan that seek to increase house building in the borough. What mechanisms will the Plan put into place to assess which policy's aims take preference?	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
805522	0	LPCD3809	Yes		S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure 0
444604	RESIDENT	LPCD608	Yes	Retain all rights of way through built up sites as narrow green lungs.	DM/8.2 Protection of Green

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Infrastructure
804944	RESIDENT	LPCD2942	0	The larger open spaces should not be developed. Rising Sun, Holy Cross and Murton are all valuable open spaces for our region.	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
805606	RESIDENT	LPCD3969	0	I have always thought north tyneside is one of the few authorities to promote outdoor spaces and wildlife areas. What happened ???	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
796814	RESIDENT	LPCD1746	In part	Some of the land north of the Shiremoor Bypass is designated Green Belt. Could this be better used for development/housing sites, and reduce the pressure on the existing road infrastructure in the rest of the Borough with it's excellent links to the A19?	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
592444	RESIDENT	LPCD3608	0	Other concerns, which will affect residents are: â€¢ Loss of natural open spaces.	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
798531	RESIDENT	LPCD2069	No	In 1.21 the words leisure and health are mentioned. In NT Allotment Strategy 2008 -2015 it stresses that allotments provide green corridors, are community assets that are enjoyed by all sections of the community, they can improve the quality of life by promoting healthy food, exercise and positive mental health. Also in the strategy it states, " The Allotment Strategy, along with other documents will form an important evidence base for devising policies within the emerging LDF that will protect and encourage enhancement of all open space within the Borough". It would seem that this has been ignored with the proposed housing development on the Shiremoor Allotment site (33). This also goes against the current climate of the desire to grow food. There is a massive interest in growing your own and subsequently extremely long waiting lists for allotments. NT council has over recent years worked hard to reclaim allotments from dereliction and create new sites, now you want to take away a site! Allotments are today more important and valuable than ever as modern housing does not include large gardens which will support the growth of sufficient edible crops. All new developments should therefore include land that allow people to participate in all the benefits allotments have to offer. Planning permission has already been obtained for the land around Shiremoor allotments making it even more important that a well established allotment site should remain.	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
592447	RESIDENT	LPCD3631	0	Other concerns, which will affect residents are: â€¢ Loss of natural open spaces.	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
797386	RESIDENT	LPCD6105	In part	In relation to green spaces generally I would like to see a stronger statement by the Council that no parks or sports facilities will be considered for housing or for employment (I suspect that this is indeed the Council's view, as can be seen by its strong support for Heritage Lottery Funds for the parks, but as this is a 15 year plan, it would be helpful to set it out clearly.)	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
805211	RESIDENT	LPCD3790	In part	Point DM/8.2 should also include reference to wildlife sites which are not "designated". There are many green spaces which are not nature reserves or designated sites that nevertheless provide forage and habitat for the borough's wildlife. These green spaces also provide vital environmental services such as the absorption of excess rain water and the capture of carbon dioxide. Nowhere in the proposed Plan is reference made to the environmental services provided by green spaces, and therefore these services are at risk! The Plan must make reference to and provide for the protection of the environmental services provided by such spaces.	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
805522	RESIDENT	LPCD3810	Yes		DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure 0
792734	RESIDENT	LPCD480	Yes	Keep green spaces and trees	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
793443	RESIDENT	LPCD772	0	Annitsford Welfare Field pavillion is 1/4 built and now abandoned. Landscaping has never been started, as promised. Gates are hardly ever locked, also as promised.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3369	Yes	Of course we need green spaces. The ones that currently exist among housing estates should be left alone and not proposed to be built on.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
794119	RESIDENT	LPCD1262	In part	Public gardens should be introduced alongside retail and services (look at Scandinavia)	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
794566	RESIDENT	LPCD1547	0	We need to have some open spaces and fields around us and another new housing development would spoil this.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
798039	RESIDENT	LPCD2214	Yes	Green spaces are very few as I like walking and I must say these green spaces should be improved as weeds, mud, water logging is in most of these spaces. Over growing trees are also a problem.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
809117	RESIDENT	LPCD6260	In part	Although the Borough is well provided with green spaces generally it is not evenly distributed and to complement the regeneration of the Victorian parks I would like to see "pockets" of green space	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				where opportunity allows for example in North Shields, Wallsend and Whitley Bay which feature row upon row of late Victorian high density "tyneside" flats.	and Standards
810335	RESIDENT	LPCD6713	0	I would strongly support the Council to save and protect our Green Spaces wherever it can. The new housing estates in Backworth, Earsdon, West Allotment, Holystone, Shiremoor, Forest Hall, Killingworth, Wellfield and elsewhere in the Borough should not be developed further. Green field development must be curtailed before NT is just one giant conurbation. NTMBC must back away from this programme to over develop our Borough and say no to building on the green field sites such as Station Road North / Whitley Road where a further 300 houses plus, are being proposed; nor at the Spine Road between West Moor and Killingworth. Strong and positive action is needed by our Council to stop this overwhelming amount of development. Having a green belt at the far north of the Borough is not supportive enough for wild life, which also need green corridors as well as more protected open spaces.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
805211	RESIDENT	LPCD3793	Yes	These targets are commendable but it is likely that this policy (DM/8.3) will contradict many of the other policies in the Local Plan which aim to increase house building in the borough. In such cases, the Plan must include and outline a mechanism to decide which policy's aims take precedence. The policy makes reference to "mitigation" where these provision standards are not adhered to. What is this mitigation? This should be outlined in the Plan.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
805542	RESIDENT	LPCD3840	Yes	At Commissioners Wharf and the surrounding residential areas surrounding the marina at Royal Quays there has been a long standing need for a local or neighbourhood park and there is no allotment provision at all. The site between the Earl of Zetland and the deep water berth which was previously and consistently turned down on planning appeal for housing could provide an ideal location for community allotment gardens and a green infrastructure natural equipped play area and possible community tourist information point to fit with the Quay, marina, long distance cycle route and community needs. This would also resolve the maintenance and use of the quay land and provide a purpose and appropriate arrival setting for the quay, without creating visual separation or development into an open riverfront aspect. This would meet and support this policy and the identified needs and objectives of the plan and could be used to provide sustainable drainage and potential flood resilience in a sensitive high risk location that is not suitable for general occupied built development.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
795649	RESIDENT	LPCD1729	0	Rising Sun area is sprawling enough as it is	8 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3371	0	Our natural environment should be considered as important as economic and social factors. Wildlife should be encouraged to flourish every where. Hedgerows are important habitat for birds. Native trees should be planted. All housing developments should make room for a good natural landscape. It will	8 Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				benefit every bodies health. Green areas with lots of plants should kept through out the borough.	
594617	RESIDENT	LPCD5941	0	What consideration for wildlife is given other than the Rising Sun?	8 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
807096	RESIDENT	LPCD4784	0	Please put the environment high on the list of factors in decision making. Don't just "reconsider". All our futures depend on it.	8 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
805490	RESIDENT	LPCD3798	0	maintain the wild life corridors from last U.D.P. Sites 22,23,24,25,26,28.make green belt, as vital wild life corridors to Rising Sun park and Gosforth park	8 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
805508	RESIDENT	LPCD4443	0	The farms are also important. The tenant at East Benton has a son to follow him in farming. We need to produce crops, not concrete!!! People need space for walking within communities. Wildlife needs several hectares to provide for their offspring - the Rising Sun Country Park will become obsolete.	8 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
444604	RESIDENT	LPCD595	0	Turn what's left of Northumberland Dock into a marina.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
806921	RESIDENT	LPCD4634	0	I am very disturbed by many aspects of the LDP and in particular its negative effect on biodiversity.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
806999	RESIDENT	LPCD4705	0	Having spent the first 20 years of my life in the area in question, practically 'growing-up' in Gosforth Park, from where I gained the fundamental love of nature that went on to form the basis of my interests, studies, career and life, I am very concerned about the idea that you will allow development that will damage, by isolation, what's left of that refuge for wildlife.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
463341	0	LPCD3533	0	You will take away all the green spaces surrounding West Moor and beyond, all wildlife will be gone when the current building sites finish and especially if the Whitehouse Farm site goes ahead as there will be nowhere for them and Gosforth Park will be a dead site.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
592444	0	LPCD3594	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Bio-diversity: The natural environment is continually being destroyed with wildlife being under huge threat with the loss of their habitat. Wildlife corridors are inadequate and no substitute for fields and hedgerows. Little or no consideration is given to migratory birds whose habitat will be gone forever.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
592447	0	LPCD3622	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Bio-diversity: The natural environment is continually being destroyed with wildlife being under huge threat with the loss of their habitat. Wildlife corridors are inadequate and no substitute for fields and hedgerows. Little or no consideration is given to migratory birds whose habitat will be gone forever.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
805211	0	LPCD3827	In part	Policy S/8.4 should also include reference to other non statutory sites, not indicated on the "policies map" but which nevertheless provide valuable habitat and forage for wildlife. For example, the agricultural land between Monkseaton / Wellfield, Murton and Shiremoor which is not designated as a wildlife site but which provides an incredibly important habitat for both resident wildlife and migratory birds entering the country. How are such sites to be afforded protection from development and how will the Local Plan mitigate any negative impacts of development on or near to those sites?	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
805479	0	LPCD4517	No	The idea that nature reserves, Marden Quarrey, The Rising Sun Country Park, Benton Quarrey etc are sustainable if all the land around is built on is plain wrong. How can you have country parks in housing estates? These locations need buffer zones around them for maximum benefit. And benefit for local people is massive. They are hugely popular recreational resourses, and like the Station Masters Garden in Whitley Bay, they are full of otherwise rare flora and fauna.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
793868	RESIDENT	LPCD1087	In part	Please let us keep some green areas, lots of housing already planned	DM/8.5 Managing Impacts upon Biodiversity and Geodiversity
794303	RESIDENT	LPCD1356	In part	Stay off protected open space	DM/8.5 Managing Impacts upon Biodiversity and Geodiversity
805211	RESIDENT	LPCD3828	In part	Policy S/8.5 is not worded to afford adequate protection for wildlife even in relation to internationally or nationally designated wildlife sites. Any proposed development should surely have no detrimental impacts on such sites whatsoever. The second paragraph of this policy and the criteria d) to f) are completely inadequate and give licence to developers to adversely impact even designated wildlife sites! No adverse impacts should be permitted at all on internationally or nationally designated sites, local designated sites, protected species, or priority species and habitats. Criteria d) would allow development as long as benefits outweigh the costs - how would this be assessed? Through cost benefit analysis alone? This does not and can not adequately capture the value that should be ascribed to our wildlife habitats. In short, this policy basically affords biodiversity in the borough little or no protection and is far too easy for developers to circumvent. It needs to afford our wildlife spaces more definitive protection, with rigorous and clearly defined criteria for any proposed development to meet and restrictions on any development which have any negative impacts at all on our designated wildlife sites.	DM/8.5 Managing Impacts upon Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
638780	RESIDENT	LPCD2252	In part	The promenade from St. Mary's Island should be continued to join the present promenade at Briardene, thus protecting the cliffs and the mini golf course which is very popular and needs to remain and the South end of the Beach regenerated back to life and any repairs updated.	AS/8.6 Coastal Erosion
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2819	In part	It is understood why we can not afford to provide a sea wall or promenade between the Briardene and Lighthouse road and East Hartley. However this stretch of coast is still an important part of the Borough and we need to ensure we provide, maintain and develop safe cliff walks and paths in these areas if we are wanting to encourage day tourists and visitors etc. The coastline is of significant value to the Borough, we don't want to see it being steadily eroded away!	AS/8.6 Coastal Erosion
805402	RESIDENT	LPCD3825	No	The boulder clay cliffs have recently been retreating at an increased rate and will shortly be undermining the eastern edge of the Briardene car park. The retreating boulder clay cliffs will also soon start to reduce the playable size of the golf course and which will then make it even more uneconomic to run if changes in the course are required as well. The obvious solution to this problem is to prevent/reduce the cliff erosion by either installing a rock barrier along the cliff as has been done on the bank by the promenade north slope onto the beach or by extending the promenade itself along the cliff to meet up with that bit of promenade leading up to St Mary's Island (a major grant will need to be obtained for this).	AS/8.6 Coastal Erosion
805522	RESIDENT	LPCD3811	Yes		AS/8.6 Coastal Erosion 0
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3372	Yes	safe cycle routes should be installed everywhere	AS/8.7 Coastal Green Links
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3374	0	A good natural landscape has enormous potential to improve our health and wellbeing. Tree planting and other landscaping with native plants will also help wildlife, look nice and take away pollutants that are in the air.	8 Trees and Woodland
792651	RESIDENT	LPCD458	0	I believe trees can have a significant social impact in addition to their health, environmental and aesthetic benefits as there is a correlation between affluence (or "perceived" affluence at the minimum) and tree coverage in urban areas. Perhaps the council would consider a specific tree-planting scheme that aims to increase "perceived affluence" by identifying those residential and commercial streets that are deficient in tree canopy coverage, and taking a measured view on how introducing greenery would benefit those areas? Potential benefits include making the area more attractive to new residents (and consequently new business) and instilling a general sense of well-being in residents.	8 Trees and Woodland
805211	RESIDENT	LPCD3829	0	On point 8.30; Where dead or dying trees are likely to be an obvious danger to people I do not disagree with the felling of those trees. However, there are many benefits to leaving dead or dying trees in place as they provide wildlife habitat for a great variety of species, including birds, mammals,	8 Trees and Woodland

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				invertebrates, lichens and fungi. There are also benefits to leaving dead wood on the ground where tree limbs or entire trees have fallen. This should be practiced in North Tyneside where this is safe to do so.	
805543	RESIDENT	LPCD3859	0	The Plan should do more here. Should trees need to be removed or fall naturally the Plan should specifically say that more new trees shall be planted than have been lost.	8 Trees and Woodland
805566	RESIDENT	LPCD4192	0	Areas of woodland must be preserved as otherwise wildlife will be severely affected - small clumps of trees is not enough - we need to maintain wildlife corridors through large areas of green space. It won't only be good for wildlife either - it will make NT a nicer place to live too	8 Trees and Woodland
792734	RESIDENT	LPCD478	Yes	Keep green spaces and trees	DM/8.8 Trees and Woodland
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3375	Yes	It is vital that all new development have a good landscaping plan. It is often the case that what gets approved at planning does not get installed at the build stage. The developer will find excuses not to build the green spaces or find problems with trees and not include them. I would ask the council to be very strict where Landscaping is concerned. It is just as important as a good quality house.	DM/8.8 Trees and Woodland
805211	RESIDENT	LPCD3830	Yes	Point DM/8.8 should also include specific reference to the types of species that should be planted, in particular these should be native species of trees and shrubs which will therefore support the widest range of British wildlife, improving sites where non native plants were previously incumbent.	DM/8.8 Trees and Woodland
805522	RESIDENT	LPCD3812	Yes		DM/8.8 Trees and Woodland
444604	RESIDENT	LPCD600	0	We need a half mile riverside country park at Wallsend (only backed by light industry like at Elswick. Have a riverside park,even a quarter mile at Willington Quay to East Howdon - like Bill Quay.	AS/8.9 Key Green spaces in Wallsend and Willington Quay
					8.1
792501	RESIDENT	LPCD330	0	My monthly quote for building insurance is £100. We had major flooding last year I was out of my house 8 months. Have you solved the problems which caused this. Badly or non existant maintainance of drains or storm drains! How can an already overloaded system support new housing? Think about it!! Before you sell your sole and make peoples' lives a misery again. Who says you care!!	8 Flood Risk
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3377	0	Would it be possible to put a stop to people paving in their front gardens? This contributes to floods. In any new housing you build could you make it a rule that all gardens front and back have soil and grass and are not concreted over with paving blocks.	8 Flood Risk

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
638471	RESIDENT	LPCD3718	0	It is over 18 months since "Thunder Thursday" and in many cases nothing has been done to prevent this happening again.	8 Flood Risk
800789	RESIDENT	LPCD2383	0	With the problems North Tyneside has had with flooding careful consideration should be given before buliding on spare land dotted around the area.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
594617	RESIDENT	LPCD5944	In part	Flooding has correlated directly to house building - Shiremoor/Backworth etc. Building on remaining sites will make this much worse. It will be a resident problem whilst the house building companies get rich.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2820	Yes	This is a very laudable aim. However this is another reason why we should be trying to avoid the construction of housing on our remaining green field sites - particularly sites 35-41 and 22-26. Both these locations are on high ground in the centre of the Borough and developments would be drained into the upstream sections of our existing sewerage systems. As a result such developments will lead to the increase likelihood of flooding from the existing downstream sewers in other residential parts of the Borough.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
463341	RESIDENT	LPCD3512	0	The lands around West Moor are also prone to severe flooding along with Killingworth Lake and also where the residents objected to planning for Whitehouse Farm. Where can they put the surface water (not into the stream which runs behind Whitecroft Road as this is on private land, not into Killingworth Lake which already always floods (and the school fields) when there is severe weather conditions as does the fields behind Greenhaugh, which probably contributed to the flood on the roundabout on the A189.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
463341	RESIDENT	LPCD3536	0	West Moor has already had severe flooding on the main employment corridor road the A196 this would only make it even more severe.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
592444	RESIDENT	LPCD3601	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Flood Risk: Many areas in North Tyneside have been affected by flooding over the last several years, which will only get worse. More building with only exacerbate this problem with nowhere for floodwater to go.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
592447	RESIDENT	LPCD3626	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Flood Risk: Many areas in North Tyneside have been affected by flooding over the last several years, which will only get worse. More building with only exacerbate this problem with nowhere for floodwater to go.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
805211	RESIDENT	LPCD3831	In part	Reducing flood risk is a commendable aim but this policy is in conflict with the Plan's general aim of increased building across the borough. No new development will be able to entirely offset its flood risk impact so there will be a net increase in flood risk in North Tyneside as a result of the building proposed in the Plan. The best way to mitigate flood risk is to retain and improve the existing green spaces across the borough which provide valuable environmental services such as the absorption of excess rain water.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
805543	RESIDENT	LPCD3862	No	Flooding and ground water levels are severe problems in North Tyneside. These must be addressed now.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
805370	RESIDENT	LPCD3547	In part	Engineering works have been proposed between Murton and West Monkseaton to reduce the risk of flooding in West Monkseaton. The proposal is to build embankments in the fields between Murton and West Monkseaton to create an artificial lake in times of high rainfall. You cannot also build houses on the land, as you plan to do according to this document. As a resident of West Monkseaton who was flooded last year, I urge you to go ahead with the flood prevention works in a timely manner and abandon the idea of building houses in the fields between Murton and West Monkseaton.	DM/8.12 Flood Reduction Works
805370	RESIDENT	LPCD3560	In part	There is a proposal to build embankments on the fields between Murton and West Monkseaton to create an artificial lake in times of high rainfall and prevent flooding in West Monkseaton. In this document you also plan to build houses on this land. As a resident of West Monkseaton who was flooded last year, I urge you to continue with the flood prevention works in a timely manner and abandon the plan to build houses on the fields between Murton and West Monkseaton.	DM/8.12 Flood Reduction Works
793701	RESIDENT	LPCD930	Yes		0 DM/8.13 Minerals
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2821	Yes	There is very limited land available for housing development within the Borough. It is therefore important that any future mineral extraction located in the Borough will not prevent the development of future housing requirements.	DM/8.13 Minerals
					8.14
592444	0	LPCD3610	0	Other concerns, which will affect residents are: - Light pollution. - Air pollution. - Noise pollution.	DM/8.15 Pollution
592447	0	LPCD3633	0	Other concerns, which will affect residents are: - Light pollution. - Air pollution. - Noise pollution.	DM/8.15 Pollution
805211	0	LPCD3832	In part	Point DM/8.15 needs to include specific reference to the protection of wildlife habitats from polluting sources. These should not be sited anywhere near any wildlife sites across the borough, especially those designated wildlife sites and SSSIs.	DM/8.15 Pollution
792484	RESIDENT	LPCD316	0	I would like the council to press commercial and other business organisations within its jurisdiction to undertake significant improvements to the fabric of their buildings (insulation etc), analogous to the	9 Sustainable Design and



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				work done on retrofitting energy efficiency measures to domestic properties.	Construction
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2752	0	These are rather good. There is some green tweaking to be done on some of them and some local input is needed on some but I quite like a good deal of these proposals.	9 Sustainable Design and Construction
					9.1
444526	RESIDENT	LPCD1371	In part	My major concern is that either or both of the major development areas are properly designed. It seems that the private development of Northumberland Park area has learnt nothing from the barren Longbenton estate that was just houses - no attempts for years at making a community from the beginning. If you compare Northumberland Park with Newcastle's development in what was Green Belt land, then Northumberland Park is lacking focus and just un-intersting housing packed in together.	DM/9.2 Design of Development
800789	RESIDENT	LPCD2385	0	I would also state that the current standard of new housing is pretty poor aesthetically and materially.	DM/9.2 Design of Development
396641	RESIDENT	LPCD5905	0	As in Coronation Street, new housing is needed to be in keeping with the present surrounding streets, preserving any existing trees, and reflecting the heritage of this area of Wallsend.	DM/9.2 Design of Development
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3391	Yes	High Design standards are an essential. Small shoe box houses should not be allowed. Encouraging people to walk and cycle is also very important.	DM/9.2 Design of Development
804944	RESIDENT	LPCD2952	0	And please build decent new properties and not ones that will be in disrepair in a few years and look awful. Stipulat that people must take pride and responsibility for the areas in which they live.	DM/9.2 Design of Development
809130	RESIDENT	LPCD6324	0	New developments never have big enough garden space and the houses are too close together. Perhaps the garden city approach?	DM/9.2 Design of Development
800879	RESIDENT	LPCD2386	Yes	Support the policy. It is important that the character and appearance of areas is maintained and if possible enhanced. There is a particular issue in Tynemouth of two storey side extensions being built on semi detached properties which form a substantial part of the housing stock. The gaps between such properties at first floor level make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Unfortunately these gaps are starting to be closed by two storey extensions and in some instances a terracing effect has been caused. In the circumstances in my opinion there needs to be a policy controlling two storey side extensions.	DM/9.3 Extending Existing Buildings
798687	RESIDENT	LPCD2130	0		S/9.4 Improving Image
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2822	Yes	You should also add "conservation areas" (such as Monkseaton and Tynemouth) to your list of locations.	S/9.4 Improving Image

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3392	Yes	Please stipulate that all this landscaping and high standard design are not seen as "nice to haves" or "add-ons" but are integral to the whole plan from planning to build to maintenance years later. Most developers will not be interested in providing a proper landscape.	S/9.4 Improving Image
805386	RESIDENT	LPCD3659	In part	Improve the image but without using shared space schemes as these cause issues for visually impaired pedestrians.	S/9.4 Improving Image
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD3041	Yes	The attributes listed under AS/9.5 for North Shields should also be equally applied to Whitley Bay town centre and also to the conservation areas of Monkseaton and Tynemouth. (This is a very important issue and should be clearly described in the Plan.)	AS/9.5 North Shields Town Centre: Public Realm
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3394	Yes	Park View, Whitley Bay is the nicest shopping street in North Tyneside if not the North East. Please do all you can to promote it and help it flourish. It is unique with independent shops of various types.	AS/9.6 Public Realm Improvements at the Coast
588681	RESIDENT	LPCD6264	0	The sea front needs developing - the coastline is beautiful but a few more facilities wouldn't go amiss. More public toilets, bring back the chalets and how about bringing back the shuggy boats on the beach. A lick of paint along the promenade would improve the appearance and maybe a few beach shops in the sheltered areas on the lower prom. If the boat was really being pushed out, how about fairy lights along the promenade and a small gauge train running between StMary's Island and Tynemouth in the summer ( ok, maybe a bit too ambitious).	AS/9.6 Public Realm Improvements at the Coast
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2824	In part	The list of planned initiatives described for North Shields under AS/9.5 (a-e) should also be applied for Whitley Bay town centre. It would also be appropriate to apply the same initiatives for our conservation areas such as in Monkseaton and Tynemouth.	AS/9.6 Public Realm Improvements at the Coast
809117	RESIDENT	LPCD6255	In part	I would like to express my specific concern regarding the apparent proposal to redevelop the former Whitley Bay library site as a car park. I have taken a close interest in the regeneration of the town since moving here over 20 years ago and am fairly sure that the Council's original intention, once the Joint Service Centre was built, was to re-incorporate the land as part of the park, as it presumably was before being "borrowed" for the library in the 1960s. A glance at the graphic provided in the consultation pack shows that while the Borough benefits from a considerable amount of green space, this is not evenly distributed and while the high building densities in the towns of Wallsend and North Shields were compensated for by the provision of large well laid out municipal parks, Whitley Bay has nothing in comparison. Although it could be argued that The Links and imminent landscaping of the Spanish City piazza provide a significant amount of green space, these do not afford the quite retreat for rest and relaxation envisaged in the traditional Victorian parks, and which, as evidenced by recent	AS/9.6 Public Realm Improvements at the Coast

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				major public grants to restore such facilities, continue to be very much valued by local people. With a rapidly growing older population, many of whom, even in recently built older peoples housing, do not appear to have access to a garden (e.g. Grosvenor Drive and Eastbourne Gardens), I firmly believe it should be a priority to protect and enhance existing green spaces, particularly in heavily built up areas typified by mid/late Victorian terrace developments. I believe there is a strong rationale for re-instating the library site as a part of the park, with contoured landscaping, seating, flower beds, shrubbery and mobility scooter friendly paths, thereby creating better equality of provision for disabled and older residents, and complementing the adjacent popular children's water park.	
805386	RESIDENT	LPCD3663	In part	If considering shared space designs consider discussions with national visually impaired charities who specialise in giving advice on its use.	AS/9.7 Wallsend: High Street Improvements
					9.8
808139	RESIDENT	LPCD5491	0	Preferred use of employment, housin, retail in the North West area to boundary - To open up area to growth and habitability.	AS/9.9 Opportunity Sites in the North West
468309	RESIDENT	LPCD271	0	In terms of recognised important buildings, I am a little at loggerheads with some of your inclusions, like the Tesco chimney, and some of the houses - but what pleases one generally displeases others. I note also that two of the listed buildings are being demolished - namely the two more modern ones in Killingworth.	S/9.10 Heritage Assets
797110	0	LPCD2753	Yes		S/9.10 Heritage Assets 0
805386	0	LPCD3669	Yes	Consider upgrading and using the derelict Tynemouth open air swimming pool. It has heritage, is ideally located and would enhance the coastal area. Lottery or similar funding could be sought.	S/9.10 Heritage Assets
803493	0	LPCD2805	Yes	The coastline is of considerable economic value to the Borough. It should be protected at all costs. The seascapes are also of great value and help attract visitors and provide iconic vista views such as the Whitley Bay lighthouse, Tynemouth Longsands, the Priory, Cullercoats etc. It is therefore important that these seascape views are protected from visual intrusion pollution from such developments as off-shore wind farm developments. The Council should be adopting a policy for handling such off-	DM/9.11 Protection, Preservation and Enhancement

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				shore developments such as asking for them to be located beyond the coastal horizon.	of Heritage Assets
					9.12
					9.13
					9.14
444604	RESIDENT	LPCD545	No	Demolish Spanish City dome - it's a "white elephant"!	AS/9.15 The Spanish City
444595	RESIDENT	LPCD644	Yes	Use Dome for indoor seaside recreation, minigolf, sand and water play, restaurant, swings etc.	AS/9.15 The Spanish City
444604	RESIDENT	LPCD3554	0		AS/9.15 The Spanish City 0
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3401	Yes	get the dome refurbished for cultural activities. a theatre with that will put on different productions to the whitley bay playhouse is badly needed. also the dome must be ran by locals and be affordable unlike the whitley bay playhouse.	AS/9.15 The Spanish City
444604	RESIDENT	LPCD3556	0	P.S. WE HAVE ABOUT 800 PEOPLE NEEDING CHEAP COUNCIL TYPE HOUSING. MANY COST THE COUNCIL A LOT, FOR FAMILIES LIVING SEMI PERMINANTLY IN "BED & BREAKFASTS", STUFF THE EMPRESS DOME, BUILD CHEAP HOUSING!	AS/9.15 The Spanish City
807758	RESIDENT	LPCD5173	No	Bulldoze the Spanish City area to provide housing/apartments	AS/9.15 The Spanish City
638474	0	LPCD2049	Yes	Crucial that the Dome is developed and advertised as a leisure/ tourism asset.	AS/9.15 The Spanish City
803493	0	LPCD2825	Yes	It is critical to adopt strategies that will change current perceptions and lead to Whitley Bay becoming a family friendly destination. Development of the dome and surrounding area can provide assistance in achieving this aim but there are also many other locations in Whitley Bay needing attention. This is going to be a long project but its achievement will ultimately be of significant value to the Borough and the wider region. Investment and continued planning is required.	AS/9.15 The Spanish City
588681	0	LPCD6247	0	I think more vision should be shown when developing a plan for Whitley Bay. I think the town should be developed as a conference town like Brighton, Harrogate and Blackpool. Why not? Instead of apartments and a care home on the Spanish City site, a large Conference centre should be built. This would attract a business clientele who would need good quality hotels. Two or three additional hotels could be built along the seafront on the sites currently derelict. In addition more classy restaurants	AS/9.15 The Spanish City

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				would be needed and this would be a boost to the night time economy which appears to have nosedived recently (thankfully as it was a type of nightlife that Whitley Bay could have done without!) These hotels and restaurants would provide employment and would also attract holidaymakers in the summer. It saddens me when I think that the Spanish City has been replaced with a primary school on prime seafront land. The land where the school used to be has lain derelict for years. I guess this land could be used for housing although it seems a great shame that the school wasn't rebuilt on the same land. Also very disappointing to see a large Care Home going up on prime seafront land (pity the poor residents in the houses behind, losing forever their sea front view). Does this building have to be so tall? I appreciate that sea views will be lovely for the residents but could this building not have been smaller? Nobody is going to visit Whitley Bay to see the Care Homes and Apartments around the sea front. We need facilities. What about pleasure gardens, ballroom (especially at the moment with the popularity of dancing) - we already have one at the Spanish City!, museum, how about a small velodrome?	
805543	0	LPCD3863	No	The Spanish City Dome has been a money pit for decades. It is time for it to be delisted and demolished.	AS/9.15 The Spanish City
					9.16
444595	RESIDENT	LPCD638	Yes	Open museum/art gallery (indoor)	AS/9.17 Town Hall, Police Court, Fire Station and Public Baths
					9.18
794027	RESIDENT	LPCD1182	0	New income is generated but not ploughed back into the community	10 General and Funding
793403	RESIDENT	LPCD714	0	Make sure this time about allowing builders to just apply and be given the go ahead without thought of future traffic jams, overcrowding. No additional applications from anyone such was the case in Wideopen at Five Mile Park now that area is over congested and the area ruined through carte blanche go ahead by Council not taking enough care in checking the planning from the onset of building.	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding
469404	RESIDENT	LPCD1108	0	What bothers most people I talk to is the perceived lack of infrastructure to support current levels of	S/10.1 General

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				development, much less future needs. What we want is an infrastructure plan to go alongside any other development plans. This should include highway enhancements/provision - public transport provision - school/doctors/retail provision and flood precautions. The list is endless and really needs to be defined.	Infrastructure and Funding
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3402	Yes	What you say must be enforced. Aslo look at current infrastructure.	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding
797110	0	LPCD2754	Yes		S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding 0
808938	RESIDENT	LPCD6074	0	<p>We would expect that any developments would be financially sustainable and would contribute to the overall benefit of the borough in terms of enhanced and improved infrastructure and services. Such benefits should be at no cost to the Tax Payer, whether Council or Income Tax. We would expect that the residents would have some say, in the spirit of localism, in how this money should be allocated. We have real concerns over the lack of detail in respect of the enhancement to the physical infrastructure and in particular the provision of roads, both new and improvements to the existing, as this is likely to be key to the overall sustainability within the Borough. This is particularly so, when, according to the Council's own figures, there is an above average car ownership in the area. We therefore consider that clause 10.2, which suggests that infrastructure may be financed by the Council should be modified. If this is the case then the proposed Development should be deemed not to be sustainable and should not go ahead. If it is considered that a Development is strictly necessary, will some form of overage calculation or clawback be incorporated in any planning agreement to ensure that excess profits are not being made by the developer if market conditions change during the development timeframe. We note that certain areas could be reclassified as housing land from being agricultural land. Is there any mechanism for "clawing back" an element of the enhanced land value that would result? Surely the likely costs for community enhancement (\$1 06 costs) should be set out now. We accept that these can only be done in broad terms, but should be robust. If this information is provided, then the potential developer could assess the cost of this risk. The result will be that residual land value may be reduced and going some way to offsetting the increased value due to a change in classification of use. It will also give the residents who may object an early indication of the likely benefits to the community. Similarly, it will simplify any future negotiations over the section 106 costs as the general heads of such costs will be known up front. There appears to be no provision for new or expanded existing schools within the plan. All forecasts, certainly in the short term, suggests that there could be a shortage of school places. We trust that the developers will make a contribution towards this provision.</p>	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
793893	RESIDENT	LPCD1099	0	Congestion will be horrendous. Have you seen the Coast road at 8am?	DM/10.2 Development Viability
797110	0	LPCD2755	Yes		DM/10.2 Development Viability
805386	0	LPCD3670	Yes	If infra structure isn't in place or won't be provided as requested by developers the development should not go ahead. No waivers should be allowed.	DM/10.2 Development Viability
790915	RESIDENT	LPCD8	0	The traffic down Park Lane and New York Road is heavily congested, on any day of the week. Any more development of any kind, would gridlock the area every day.	10 Connectivity and Transport
790982	0	LPCD21	0	Pressure on public transport will be particularly high if the population in the area were to increase. Particular emphasis on the metro system for daily commuters is needed.	10 Connectivity and Transport
791875	RESIDENT	LPCD181	0	Currently Wideopen is inadequately geared to combat severe weather conditions. We are trapped if this is repeated.	10 Connectivity and Transport
792059	RESIDENT	LPCD224	0	You need to encourage the following in the next 10-20 years: 3. More use of bicycles	10 Connectivity and Transport
798606	RESIDENT	LPCD2105	0	Extend the metro to Annitsford, seaton burn, wideopen.	10 Connectivity and Transport
798606	RESIDENT	LPCD2107	0	Reduce the parking restrictions around the borough- Whitley Bay has the right idea charging by the minute.	10 Connectivity and Transport
464281	RESIDENT	LPCD2405	0	New housing development - there are serious concerns about the volumes of traffic that could lead to traffic jams on leaving these estates. I think a solution to the problem could be found if ALL main roads around the Borough were to be marked with Double Yellow lines/Camera monitored & with cycle lanes.	10 Connectivity and Transport
638471	0	LPCD3717	0	Years ago it was planned to construct a road linking Norham Road North and Cauldwell Avenue. Such a link would divert traffic from Rake Lane, Seatonville Road and Earsdon Road.	10 Connectivity and Transport
798883	0	LPCD2172	0	The infrastructure like the metro would not cope with such an increase in population (Shiremoor area) as it seems to be working to capacity at peak times. Also provision of police and emergency services would need expanding - the increase in housing and population is not a good idea when, for example, A&E at North Tyneside hospital is closing. I think the planned housing development sites would be extremely detrimental to the area and the infrastructure would not cope.	10 Connectivity and Transport
805358	0	LPCD3581	0	Not enough about cycling and cycle ways. North Tyneside is relatively flat and has a good basic network for becoming a real beacon area for cycling. With a bit of imagination you could 'put the	10 Connectivity and Transport

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				borough on the map' when it comes to cycling. This could be good for both commuting and for tourism. Do you have a cycle plan?	
805549	0	LPCD4170	0	The A191 Rake Lane, New York Road and A192 Earsdon Road can become heavily congested in peak travel due to Cobalt Business Park, hospital visiting times and commuters travelling from the A19 or the A1058 Coast Road to Monkseaton, Whitley Bay A192 and parts of North Shields. There is no reference in the Infrastructure background paper to upgrade or significantly improve these road links to support an additional 1500 to 2000 homes planned in Table Sites 35, 36, 41 and potentially 40. With approximately 65-70% of houses owning cars and many households with more than 1 car, this could lead to an increase upto 2500 cars per day on the routes mentioned. This does not account for tourism traffic and the number of empty office buildings at Cobalt Park which are yet to bring more traffic to New York Road. Although I am in favor of bringing new homes to the area I would like to see adequate road planning for the Table sites listed (35, 36, 41 and 40) either via the A186 Shiremoor road to reduce congestion hotspots around New York Road, Rake Lane, Earsdon Road, Middle Engine Lane. Or only develop areas 37, 38, 39 and 40 using access via the new road links of the A186 Shiremoor. Also the introduction of direct access to Cobalt Business Park from the A19 would reduce peak traffic flow on New York Road.	10 Connectivity and Transport
809765	RESIDENT	LPCD6599	0	I may have not seen your cycling proposals but I would like the plan to include major off road but convenient cycle routes to join Newcastle/North Tyneside to the coast " at least one route connecting with the South Gosforth wagonway via the Rising Sun Park and linking in a direct manner to Earsdon/St Mary's Lighthouse/Seaton Sluice area. Another route to the coast should be created approximating to the Coast Road and providing a safe and direct cycle access to Whitley Bay.	10 Connectivity and Transport
468309	RESIDENT	LPCD270	Yes	I support the fact that transport and travel are a necessary part of a sustainable and expanding North Tyneside, and that it is right the Council include this in planning for the future. I support fully the theme to address/encourage the travelling ability of cyclists.	S/10.3 Transport
444595	RESIDENT	LPCD639	0	Provide a bus along the coast - Fish Quay, Tynemouth to St Mary's Lighthouse	S/10.3 Transport
590131	RESIDENT	LPCD1104	0	To build more homes within built up areas will lead to even more congestion on roads which cannot cope at peak times.	S/10.3 Transport
793476	RESIDENT	LPCD815	0	The roads are already very busy so you will gridlock them. Common sense is required to stop this development. Our road system simply cannot take it, it will become worse than London	S/10.3 Transport
794027	RESIDENT	LPCD1183	0	The pedestrian is rarely considered	S/10.3 Transport
472456	RESIDENT	LPCD3403	Yes	encouraging the use of public transport and walking and cycling should be atop priority for the council. Could the metro take bikes? Use of cars on already congested roads should be discouraged.	S/10.3 Transport



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
803190	RESIDENT	LPCD2432	0	Please, please look at the traffic situation through Westmoor Mon - Fri. From 7:30am until 9:00am traffic backs-up from "Findus" roundabout right along the the Great Lime Road to Clousden Hill.	S/10.3 Transport
805053	RESIDENT	LPCD3101	0	The 1056 needs dueling and this would improve the north side of life in the Borough.	S/10.3 Transport
805085	RESIDENT	LPCD3205	0	I am a non-driver and believe in a viable public transport network which is cheap.	S/10.3 Transport
807169	RESIDENT	LPCD4865	0	What do you consider to be "public transport networks" roads? Trains? Bus routes? Are existing road networks adequate for future developments? Is there funding for new roads? We have some already extremely congested roads in the West Monkseaton Area, with a new estate presently under construction which will add to the problem. Please consider this before developing sites 39, 40, 41 and other sites around Murton.	S/10.3 Transport
807243	RESIDENT	LPCD4934	0	You should not build if there is no transport. You can't get a bus to Rake Lane hospital from Forest Hall. The last Mayor took them off. The new Mayor Norma Redfearn has done nothing to even try to get one or two of the half dozen that have been taken off reinstated. You should not have to get more than one bus too Gosforth High Street.	S/10.3 Transport
807330	RESIDENT	LPCD5001	0	Better public transport links to leisure sites e.g. Tynemouth Pool	S/10.3 Transport
807432	RESIDENT	LPCD5049	0	Most of the other undeveloped areas will lead to congestion on already very busy roads	S/10.3 Transport
807544	RESIDENT	LPCD5081	0	Killingworth/Longbenton proposals " the current road networks is too busy already and cannot cope with existing traffic let alone additional traffic brought about by housing (retail) developments.	S/10.3 Transport
808018	RESIDENT	LPCD5413	0	My main concern is the lack of planning for road improvement or new roads. The last consultation was the "Sandy Lane By-Pass". This to be off the radar? Question:- Do you have any plans for road improvement? What is your "evidence based growth for cars?!!	S/10.3 Transport
793445	0	LPCD769	In part	I believe that with the expected increased housing in killingworth that the previous station should be restored linking it to Manors and Cramlington. Cramlington has already seen massive redevelopment and would also benefit from this link.	S/10.3 Transport
797110	0	LPCD2756	In part	Public Transport: We need to get a greater realisation of electric & kinetic forms of mass transport such as trolleybus and electric ferry's. Also using the cable supports as electric car charging points. Road Network: reduce congestion by removing cars - car pooling should be encouraged (parking fees dependent on the number of people in the car - more people less fee?) Pedestrians, Cyclists and Horse-Riders: Could go a lot further.	S/10.3 Transport
463341	0	LPCD3538	0	Who wants to cycle along the side of a very busy dual carriageway as with all these developments that's all cyclists will have left. Gone will be the cycle path through the fields of West Moor and through Killingworth and Backworth.	S/10.3 Transport
466426	0	LPCD4415	0	The Great Lime Rd, Sandy Lane, A189 and the A188 are all heavily congested at peak times and even	S/10.3

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				with the alterations on the A189 any further development around this area will only make things much worse. I'm sure Blyth Valley will also be increasing its Development Areas and this will have a knock on effect on the amount of traffic using these roads to access Newcastle/ N. Tyneside.	Transport
592444	0	LPCD3589	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Highways: Increase in traffic from such developments, proposed or otherwise, will only add to an already struggling road system. The current development at Wide-open is already creating additional problems and the new hospital at East Cramlington will have a huge impact in all areas of North Tyneside bringing with it itâ€™s own problems	S/10.3 Transport
592447	0	LPCD3621	0	Please note my objection to the above Local Plan on the following grounds. Highways: Increase in traffic from such developments, proposed or otherwise, will only add to an already struggling road system. The current development at Wide-open is already creating additional problems and the new hospital at East Cramlington will have a huge impact in all areas of North Tyneside bringing with it itâ€™s own problems	S/10.3 Transport
805429	0	LPCD4431	No	Recently, there has been an Aldi built on the road where traffic is slowing down and turning more and there is parking on the road/pavement and at the top of Palmers Green at peak times. This means getting in and out of some housing estate roads can already be problematic and take up to ten minutes a time with little possibility of turning across the traffic to go in the desired direction. A robust plan to either avoid Great Lime Road or widen it has to be considered and if not possible then the housing planned that would directly add traffic to this road should be avoided.	S/10.3 Transport
805504	0	LPCD4453	0	Village roads are not meant for more traffic the roads are in a bad condition now what will they be like with even more volume on them?	S/10.3 Transport
805505	0	LPCD3759	No	The site no 14 has very poor access. This land is hemmed in by existing housing, metro and rail lines. There is and can only ever be one small road to access these houses unless of course a few are knocked down. The main access roads Whitley Road and Station Road are becoming increasingly congested due to the recent expansion of housing. Junctions can be enlarged but the traffic still has to convergeâ€¦ unless the roads are widened at the expense of houses.	S/10.3 Transport
805514	0	LPCD3792	In part	The north west Benton curve rail alignment should also be safeguarded as a transport route to allow future rail expansion including links to Cramlington and Morpeth. This potential would be lost if site 14 is designated for housing.	S/10.3 Transport
805536	0	LPCD3817	In part	It's a real disappointment to not see any protection of a formation for rail for Killingworth and the surrounding area. There are some real opportunities to develop the area if Killingworth can get access on to the heavy/light rail network. The Council has access to a lot of information including traffic flow data, mapping software and knowledge of assets. The Council could help local residents by showing them what they can access on an easy to use portal that is online.	S/10.3 Transport
797386	0	LPCD6109	In part	Cycle Routes - we are very lucky to have the waggonways. There is also the route along the river towards Newcastle, though this is pretty tortuous. I would like to see more thought put into adding	S/10.3 Transport

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
				safe cycle lanes to as many of our roads as possible.	
792059	RESIDENT	LPCD225	0	Any large development should offer underground parking	DM/10.4 New Development and Transport
792542	RESIDENT	LPCD408	0	Private housing is being built in Wideopen which will increase the traffic problem. Bus service to Wideopen/Seaton Burn is very poor with the service 43 often missing.	DM/10.4 New Development and Transport
805386	0	LPCD3671	In part	10.26 - Use of shared space can cause issues if not introduced correctly. Ask visually impaired organisations as they can explain the drawbacks as well as the benefits.	DM/10.4 New Development and Transport
805825	0	LPCD4159	No	North Tyneside suffers terribly from the over-urbanisation of the Borough and the impacts that that has on traffic flows. There are simply too many cars for the Borough's roads to cope with. Trying to get anywhere from the Coast Road eastwards is impossible any where near rush hour and often outside rush hour. It would be impossible to improve the wider road network to account for the new developments and traffic congestion will become a nightmare leaving to poor quality of life and environmental pollution. It's currently at a tipping point where moving out of North Tyneside is becoming the only viable option.	DM/10.4 New Development and Transport
808091	RESIDENT	LPCD5428	0	Wherever new housing is built there will be an increasing problem of residential car parking. Certain streets are now reduced to single lane traffic due to the number of vehicles parked at both sides with some on the grass verges. There is no point in having a grass verge that no longer looks attractive - I feel that consideration be given to the conversion of grass verges into actual parking bays where deemed necessary.	DM/10.4 New Development and Transport
808938	RESIDENT	LPCD6080	0	We note that Public Transport is to be a feature of the Local Plan. As much of Public Transport is subject to subsidy, we trust that no further burden will be placed on the council tax payers and that the relevant developers will make a significant contribution to such subsidies.	DM/10.4 New Development and Transport
631932	0	LPCD293	In part	Lack of cycle tracks on the coast is scandalous and very dangerous. As a cyclist I dread it and virtually every time I cycle on it I have an accident.	AS/10.5 Coastal Transport
793476	RESIDENT	LPCD813	In part	Very much reduce traffic at the coastal belt. People flock here at weekends and the first sign of decent weather	AS/10.5 Coastal Transport
803493	0	LPCD2826	Yes	Agree with all the points a-f. However, I would suggest that point e - additional parking for Whitley Bay town centre - should be top priority. Many visitors and Borough residents to Whitley Bay coast will want to visit several areas of the borough on the same day. Would it be worthwhile providing a day parking ticket that would allow visitors to park at any site in the Borough - it would encourage visitors	AS/10.5 Coastal Transport

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				to stay for the day and visit a series of different facilities in the Borough - even if it is just for a short time. Similarly, residents of the Borough could be provided with the opportunity to purchase an annual or seasonal parking ticket allowing them say maximum of an hours stop in any car parking area. It would encourage residents to shop locally and visit different parts and facilities across the borough.	
805386	0	LPCD3672	Yes	But also consider improving the cycle paths and in the summer months consider the introduction of a free train from the outlying car parks to the town centre / spanish city / tynemouth. It will bring families in but would encourage the use of outlying car parks.	AS/10.5 Coastal Transport
805402	0	LPCD3826	In part	1. Any prospective development in the Murton areas 35 - 41 will need to include improvements to the Whitley Bay main access roads. Within this area there needs to be main access roads from the A186 Earsdon/Shiremoor road at Shiremoor and the A191 New York road linking together and then joining onto the western end of Cauldwell Avenue. This will relieve the morning and afternoon major traffic congestion along Earsdon Road and Seatonville Road. 2. The very short section of A191 road at the Foxhunter's Pub between the two roundabouts needs the west bound lane to be widened and made into two lanes thus allowing traffic coming from the Ice Rink direction to run in parallel at the roundabout with traffic coming from Seatonville Road. This roundabout will need double lines painted on the road around it to keep the traffic in their appropriate lanes. 3. Consideration needs to be given for a future new entrance to Whitley Bay from the A186 Earsdon roundabout. This road would roughly take the route of the present Hartley Lane, past the Beehive pub and then cut across to join the A193 Blyth road by the Feathers Caravan Park, then leading onto the Links dual carriageway road into Whitley Bay town center.	AS/10.5 Coastal Transport
793476	RESIDENT	LPCD813	In part	Very much reduce traffic at the coastal belt. People flock here at weekends and the first sign of decenet weather	AS/10.5 Coastal Transport
					10.6
					10.7
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2757	In part	This is a clasic "cosmetic green" area and needs careful consideration as it could open things up for energy production that is only cosmetically green. Underground Coal Gasification and Aquatic Ffracturing have not been rulled out! How renewable is renewable?	DM/10.8 Renewable Energy and Low-Carbon Technologies
797386	RESIDENT	LPCD6107	No	I would like to see a statement in the plan the no wind turbines will be erected in the area, onshore or offshore.	DM/10.8 Renewable Energy and

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Low-Carbon Technologies
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4952	Yes	The enforcement body for S(u)Ds should be NTC as the planning authority having local knowledge of the area (augmented by residents' observations) using appropriate discharge conditions. a. Discharge to ground should be to soakaways - some older houses already have these but compromised by renovations that mix foul water from such as washing machines with roof drainage. b. Discharge to surface water body should include balancing ponds which slow run-off to streams etc. and can provided amenity value to local communities and contribute to bio-diversity. c. There can be a local surface water sewer but they should not themselves be connected downstream to combined sewers (as sofor example in Hillheads Road). d. Developments in old town centres will make this necessary as most of the existing sewers are combined from Victorian times.	DM/10.10 : Sustainable Drainage
806103	RESIDENT	LPCD4289	0	As a former resident of Gosforth and, hopefully, about to be a resident of Gosforth Garden Village I am also very concerned about implications for the Sustainable Drainage System that is under such extreme pressure in Newcastle, as I am far from being reassured about the efficacy of planning relating to recently completed developments.	DM/10.10 : Sustainable Drainage
800362	RESIDENT	LPCD2281	In part	Any proposed future development will need to massively exceed current building regulation requirements for drainage, particularly in areas where flooding is an issue. Too many developments have been allowed in the recent past without enough thought given to drainage and the impact of developments on the local area. I am opposed to any development that will have a detrimental impact on other properties. I do not feel this policy goes far enough to identifying how developments will help to avoid flooding.	DM/10.10 : Sustainable Drainage
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2827	In part	There is still considerable concern about the use of sustainable drainage lakes (Suds) for development sites. Long term responsibility and maintenance for these lakes is difficult and such lakes can lead to stagnant water, mosquitos, rubbish collection etc. They can be a danger to children and are not always effective in prolonged periods of rainfall or snow melt. This is another reason to try and avoid developments on our green field sites. In particular, we should be trying to avoid the construction of housing on our remaining green field sites - particularly sites 35-41 and 22-26. Both these locations are on high ground in the centre of the Borough and developments would be drained into the upstream sections of our existing sewerage systems. As a result such developments will lead to the increase likelihood of flooding from the existing downstream sewers in other residential parts of the Borough.	DM/10.10 : Sustainable Drainage
791875	RESIDENT	LPCD178	0	Has recycling increased? more publicity required.	S/10.11 Waste Management
451420	RESIDENT	LPCD4953	Yes	But a waste to energy plant in North Tyneside should be included as an option, rather than assuming there will be one in neighbouring LAs.	S/10.11 Waste Management

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
797110	RESIDENT	LPCD2758	In part	The opening needs to recognise that recycling is also about end-product use so a commitment by the council to give priority to using recycled products as well as collecting the stuff. The collected stuff to be called secondary use resources. In all the sub-points, but epically f, get the message that we should think of this stuff as a secondary resource and should be used otherwise it is not a cycle.	S/10.11 Waste Management
805566	RESIDENT	LPCD4194	In part	South Tyneside provides the opportunity to recycle many more types of waste - why doesn't North Tyneside. It is fine to say that you will work with others in the North East region, but people want the facilities as close to home as possible or they won't use them. Also, NT recycling is for NT residents only - so we probably can't use those further afield - we need our own	S/10.11 Waste Management
					10.12
792734	RESIDENT	LPCD482	0	Provide schools, safe play areas, doctors surgeries, chemists, shops	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure
444595	RESIDENT	LPCD640	0	Move Tyne Met College to River Tyne North Bank and replace with mixed housing and retail	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure
469329	RESIDENT	LPCD2613	Yes	We do need to improve some of the facilities in the region. It would be better to redevelop and improve sites like the ice rink area and the open air swimming pool at Tynemouth as these benefit not only the local population but also tourism in the area. I am also concerned that with the number of proposed new houses to be built in the area what will happen with schools? I have not seen anything to indicate new schools will be built yet with hundreds of houses surely the existing facilities will soon be under strain and education within the borough will begin to suffer.	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure
808652	RESIDENT	LPCD5893	0	The extra housing will mean more families, therefore more schools and drs surgeries will be required.	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure
808938	RESIDENT	LPCD6098	0	We note that there is a suggestion that some of the sites are designated as having community uses of various sorts, which is only to be applauded as long as these are meaningful and capable of being self financing.	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD2828	Yes	Objective e states that "the quantity and quality of open space ..... throughout the Borough will be maintained and enhanced". This again indicates that it would not be appropriate to construct high levels of housing on our greenfield sites such as sites 35-41.	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure
591698	RESIDENT	LPCD3124	0	The reduction in walk-in health centres and the inevitable loss of Rake Lane hospital will leave a 200,000+ population without adequate health cover.	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Comm_ID</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Section</b>
805504	RESIDENT	LPCD4454	No	There are not enough school placements so it means putting pupils in portacabins which in this day is not right Then you have Doctors you already have to wait at least 2 weeks to see one	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure
793445	RESIDENT	LPCD771	In part	New housing developments should offer choice where possible and not just BT broadband. Support should be encouraged to connect to other services (Virgin Media etc.)	DM/10.14 Telecommunica tions - Broadband, mobile phone masts and equipment
791886	RESIDENT	LPCD192	0	There are far too many houses being built in a small area, we do not want any more. Why don't you just concrete it all over and be done with it. It is a giant rubbish dump. No housing in Shiremoor. You cannot now get a Doctors appointment for sometimes two weeks, due to the overdevelopment here, and the increased risk of flooding (which has occurred) because all the drainage land has been built on and causes flooding because there are not enough drains to cope and flood plains.	11 Potential Development Sites
792501	RESIDENT	LPCD327	0	What rubbish. Does it really make a difference what locals think!! No!!	11 Potential Development Sites
792502	RESIDENT	LPCD332	0	There are more than enough unused brown sites and unused industrial sites that can be redeveloped for housing, leisure or industry.	11 Potential Development Sites
792554	RESIDENT	LPCD393	0	Most sites listed would appear suitable for a mix of housing, retail and employment except the following 17, 18, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40 and 41. These sites should remain as they are.	11 Potential Development Sites
396802	RESIDENT	LPCD791	0	Land is required for development but should be sites that have a high possibility of being occupied	11 Potential Development Sites
792734	RESIDENT	LPCD474	0	Avoid too much green field development	11 Potential Development Sites
792841	RESIDENT	LPCD502	0	No new sites – rebuild / refurbish existing areas.	11 Potential Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
793768	RESIDENT	LPCD1010	0	Preference would be to give small contractors an opportunity to develop small sites - keeping profits etc in the borough rather than allowing huge companies to support their shareholders elsewhere	11 Potential Development Sites
793796	RESIDENT	LPCD1044	0	I would develop all the very small areas/options as a priority. Especially for use for low cost housing.	11 Potential Development Sites
794185	RESIDENT	LPCD1309	0	As a member of UKIP and a member of the local community I say no to building near or on the "Green Belt" - if this is to occur mass protests will take place. I can help on the suitability of land selection. To ensure the residents of the newer generation are named.	11 Potential Development Sites
794805	RESIDENT	LPCD1551	0	No to new homes. No to all.	11 Potential Development Sites
675953	RESIDENT	LPCD1694	0	Broadly speaking I think areas which are green field sites should be protected wherever possible in North Tyneside. However, there may be some areas such as exists on the Earsdon side of Backworth which are full of old scruffy pit land and this is the type of land we should be building on, not on nice green fields. This may be included in area 33 already. I strongly support schemes such as the clearing on redundant offices at Killingworth and using the land for housing. If there are others no doubt you will be aware of them. Maybe some development around Killingworth is unavoidable up to a point, but your proposals are overkill. The same applies to areas 17 and 18 as well as areas 35 to 41. If all this went ahead the roads would be in permanent gridlock. The traffic situation in Benton etc is already highly unsatisfactory as you will be aware. I am placing comments on the web site regarding the possible development of the land behind Midhurst Road, Benton which is of interest to me as I am a resident. Such small sites are to be treasured as allotments or nature reserves or parks etc especially as it seems that the conurbation is to grow further.	11 Potential Development Sites
795294	RESIDENT	LPCD1616	0	No building on green belt. Adapt empty blocks for apartment accomodation. Residents of N/T are being hemmed in - we need oen space as does wildlife/ Please tell Mr Pickles. Travelling to work must be a nightmare on our cngested roads. My concerns are for future generations. No to farm land. Green belt. Why are our farmers not using land for produce instead of importing food?	11 Potential Development Sites
797142	RESIDENT	LPCD1753	0	Use of existing employment land before using any of the other sites.	11 Potential Development Sites
797315	RESIDENT	LPCD1778	0	I do not have the expertise to answer these questions, but: Whichever areas are chosen for development the ratio of green to grey areas within that development should at least equal that elsewhere on the map.	11 Potential Development Sites
799493	RESIDENT	LPCD2228	0	I am writing to object to the draft local housing plan to build on local fields bit by bit our greenfield sites diminishing. I think the mayor should change her plan .Thank You	11 Potential Development



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Sites
800453	RESIDENT	LPCD2344	0	Can't say as I do not know all the sites.	11 Potential Development Sites
800519	RESIDENT	LPCD2362	0	SUPPORTS ALL SITES	11 Potential Development Sites
801285	RESIDENT	LPCD2289	0	AGREES WITH ALL SITES"Happy for all sites to come forward for development"	11 Potential Development Sites
467684	RESIDENT	LPCD2415	0	<p>I wish to comment on the proposed sites around Shiremoor, Murton and New York. May I point out that planning permission has already been rejected for a proposed road from the house in the middle of the field towards the top of Cauldwell Lane. If as is being proposed by the council that this land is to be developed for housing then the owner of the property will get many roads to choose from and built at the councils expense. Also the land is owned by Persimmons the builders and who are going to get the contract if the go-ahead is given for housing. Concerning the field for housing, does the council understand that the roads in the area are already congested and with this development then further problems e.g gridlock accidents etc will greatly increase. Earsdon Road is a nightmare to cross during the day and with extra traffic will be even more so ( don't forget the building of 200 houses already on the field opposite the Beacon pub will have a further detrimental effect on this road on completion). The land proposed by the council is crossed by a public bridleway and I presume this will disappear. Also the land is prone to flooding ( as I understand Northumbria Water have said that present sewerage provision will be inadequate and that they do not propose to increase this provision to cope with the massive amount of sewerage this development will produce). There are a number of brown field sites in the Borough that could be developed before any thought is given to the development of this site and I am sure the demand for housing (if at all necessary on the scale proposed by the council ) can be met by using these brown field sites.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
470965	RESIDENT	LPCD4353	0	<p>It is evident from the Weetslade Ward Summary Map that the council are giving consideration to residential and / or employment on a greenfield site (labelled number 4) to the east of the industrial estate and railway line near Burradon. We therefore request that further consideration be given to the following areas that may also be able to meet future residential and or employment demands within the borough. Namely, land to the north western edge of Burradon, which is adjacent to both industrial and residential areas, yet curtailed from merging with Dudley by the A189. Alternatively the land in the first field to the east of Dudley would offer an excellent residential opportunity , with good facilities and accessibility, it already being adjacent to an established residential area. Neither of these sites has previously been assessed for any form of development and as such we suggest that they be given</p>	11 Potential Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				consideration.	
798761	RESIDENT	LPCD3451	0	The other pink striped areas are, I presume largely "Brownfield" areas suitable for mixed development to improve the quality of life.	11 Potential Development Sites
805010	RESIDENT	LPCD3059	0	As the housing is to be provided by 2030 I see no need for all to be identified now as, if speed at which the former Boys Club site has been developed is anything to go by, construction nowadays takes no time at all.	11 Potential Development Sites
805085	RESIDENT	LPCD3206	0	Not near the RSCP or St. Marys L/house because it adversely affects already threatened wildlife.	11 Potential Development Sites
805237	RESIDENT	LPCD3292	0	Surely this is why you are paid huge salaries - you are "supposed" to be the experts - you tell us why one site is better than another - for whatever reason. I am sure you are aware that a large proportion of the residents of North Tyneside have very little faith in the 'hierarchy' of the council. End of the day you will do what you want.	11 Potential Development Sites
805247	RESIDENT	LPCD3301	0	Whilst I appreciate the government has set targets on new housing developments and this requires you to identify potential sites for the next 15 years; however having looked at some of the sites I am deeply concerned about your choices.	11 Potential Development Sites
805780	RESIDENT	LPCD4122	0	Instead of building on farmland why not invest, develop and transform New York Industrial Estate into a small village.	11 Potential Development Sites
805839	RESIDENT	LPCD4764	0	There are other sights in Whitley Bay area that could be used for housing ( of which the majority should be affordable) such as the High Point Hotel site which has been derelict for over 10 years, this is also the case for many other smaller sites on the coastal front. Throughout North Tyneside there are other industrial sites which have been left derelict which should be used for a mixture of developments.	11 Potential Development Sites
807150	RESIDENT	LPCD4820	0	While I recognise that there is no plan to build on all areas highlighted for potential development - I am concerned that it has created a mild sense of panic among people I know. I would like to be reassured that land already owned by developers - which is considerable- is not prioritised for whatever reason. This is about the good of the people of north tyneside - not massive development companies who have bought up agricultural land and waited quietly for planning laws to relax.	11 Potential Development Sites
807162	RESIDENT	LPCD4842	0	None [in response to the question, please list the sites you would prefer to see developed for housing, employment and retail growth]	11 Potential Development Sites
807243	RESIDENT	LPCD4930	0	There seems to be ample land available with planning permission on it already without wanting more Wideopen and Shiremoor New York. All have good public transport.	11 Potential Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
808938	RESIDENT	LPCD6081	0	We accept that not all the sites identified in the plan will be included in the Final Development Plan. However, it is difficult to assess how the final decision will be made as the principles set out in Paras 11.4 and 11 .7 are particularly broad and could cover any number of sites. While we accept that the published documents are a first draft, they do not appear to contain much in the way of joined-up thinking. Similarly, there does not appear to be any real benefit to the wider community. We note that not all the identified sites will be incorporated in the final proposals and much work still needs to be done before a final decision is made. However, the document appears not to state the objective criteria by which the suitability of any particular site will be judged. We have concerns that the decisions will be Developer and Land Owner led and will not be to the overall benefit of the residents.	11 Potential Development Sites
809054	RESIDENT	LPCD6095	0	I live near to the huge greenfield area between the hospital and Earsdon. I do not feel that it is for me to say, "Build somewhere else!" All I can say with certainty is that the present road infrastructure will not sustain further building in the area. Escape from Whitley Bay between 0730 and 0900 is already a nightmare. The ongoing new development between West Monkseaton and Earsdon is going to further add to the problems that exist. I hope common sense prevails and guides the decision making process. To an extent your hands are tied by central government, a government which does not respond kindly to the north.	11 Potential Development Sites
810335	RESIDENT	LPCD6716	0	I would strongly support the Council to save and protect our Green Spaces wherever it can. The new housing estates in Backworth, Earsdon, West Allotment, Holystone, Shiremoor, Forest Hall, Killingworth, Wellfield and elsewhere in the Borough should not be developed further. Green field development must be curtailed before NT is just one giant conurbation. NTMBC must back away from this programme to over develop our Borough and say no to building on the green field sites such as Station Road North / Whitley Road where a further 300 houses plus, are being proposed; nor at the Spine Road between West Moor and Killingworth. Strong and positive action is needed by our Council to stop this overwhelming amount of development. Having a green belt at the far north of the Borough is not supportive enough for wild life, which also need green corridors as well as more protected open spaces.	11 Potential Development Sites
790982	0	LPCD22	0	I would ask that built up or "waste" land is used before and prioritised above open space and fields. The area near palmersville metro station which has recently been built on is an excellent use of space, as was the new aldi on the great lime road. The west park development at Monkseaton is a less desirable area to build on.	11 Potential Development Sites
792504	0	LPCD360	0	There are many un-occupied empty offices on Cobalt and Quorum built speculatively a number of years ago. Why build more! There are also a number of industrial estates which have many vacant properties - why designate new ones. On your map nothing is mentioned about housing developments currently being built on the former Gas Board site and adjacent offices and the former Stanley Miller site at Benton Square. The council are to be congratulated for the use of brownfield sites in preference to the loss of yet more open space. The potential loss of historic Killingworth Moor turned over to	11 Potential Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>mass housing should be seriously questioned in addition to the development sort by Persimmon at the top of Station Road where it meets Whitley Road. This would isolate the Country Park and join Wallsend up with Benton, Forest Hall Shiremoor etc. etc. etc. The main road arteries leading into Newcastle are already at capacity at peak times. Apparently £m's are to be spent on revamping Four Lane Ends intersection - although what can be done in such a restricted area is minimal. There is simply no justification for the huge increase in the number of houses in the borough other than to appease the major house builders and meet imposed Central Government targets and far from caring for the natural environment of North Tyneside, the council are seeking to utilise every green space within the borough to the detriment of its residents.</p>	
793168	0	LPCD694	0	<p>site 48, SHLAA Ref 219 I have several reservations regarding building on this land. Firstly the potential homes is given as 41. Do you have any further details regarding these homes? Will they be in keeping with the homes in the area? (i.e. terraced houses)? The parking in this area is appalling. This is due to overspill from the playhouse when there is a show on and also with parents picking up there children from the school by car. I have serious concerns regarding parking provision for these homes. Also, how many stories would these properties be? Would they interfere with the sea view of some of the properties in this area?</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
455909	0	LPCD2259	0	<p>Re: Station Road North, Wallsend. No sooner was the ink dry on my letter of thanks/congratulations to Planning Committee for REJECTING Persimmon's application to build on the land next to the Rising Sun (north of Sunholme Drive) than it appears as a development site on this Local Plan. I absolutely give up. Four years of lobbying and petitioning and the celebrations last exactly 24 hours before our esteemed council wreck it all again.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
463028	0	LPCD2284	0	<p>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 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</p>	11 Potential Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>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 given to the council last year.</p>	
796814	0	LPCD1747	0	<p>The development area number 33 on the local plan. This includes the Shiremoor Allotments which serves a large community of gardeners with their shop. As there is a very large waiting list for most of our Allotment Sites, I believe this is a mistake. At the very least an equivalent area should be set aside.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
798338	0	LPCD2064	0	<p>First of all may I say how good it is to be informed of proposed plans and consulted as to my opinion. The development sites 35-41 centred on Murton, should, I think, be developed for housing with some necessary local shops, schools etc. I say this because it is surrounded by other residential development and lies close to the metro line and road infrastructure. I have similar views about sites22-28. Sites17 +18 could be developed as industrial estates, extending the trading estates off Whitley Rd, or they could be used to extend the north of Wallsend housing area. I have had second thoughts about site 14 since posting off my reply to you. Inow think it best used for allotments or other green space uses, because it has severe drawbacks for residential use. The main railway line borders this site and so does the metro, so there is constant noise from trains. The area was once used as allotments, but suffered from vandals. Perhaps better security might be the answer.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
798883	0	LPCD2171	0	<p>Far too many green areas are selected for the building of new homes especially around Monkseaton/Shiremoor and Killingworth. We should keep our green areas. The infrastructure like the metro would not cope with such an increase in population (Shiremoor area) as it seems to be working to capacity at peak times. Also provision of police and emergency services would need expanding - the increase in housing and population is not a good idea when, for example, the A&amp;E at North Tyneside hospital is closing. I think the planned housing development sites would be extremely detrimental to the area.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
798883	0	LPCD2173	0	<p>The development and building on derelict areas in the region would be of benefit to the area but not on green areas/land. We should keep our green areas and concentrated on using wasteland. As previously mentioned, the infrastructure would need to be developed - inc private systems such as the metro - in order to cope.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
800362	0	LPCD2282	0	<p>I am extremely concerned by the volume of homes potentially to be built and in particular, the number of sites that have been identified for development. As a resident of Monkseaton, I am aware that many of the sites in the local area are greenfield sites and I genuinely do not feel it is appropriate to</p>	11 Potential Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>build on this land. There will be very little open space left if these developments are progressed and I am very, very concerned by this. As a high end tax payer, I will be considering leaving the area for good if these developments are progressed. I love North Tyneside, but with all of this extra housing and the additional strain on infrastructure that it will inevitably bring, the area will be damaged irrevocably.</p>	
800748	0	LPCD2364	0	<p>The area of Monkseaton is already a very dense built up area. To remove our last bit of green fields would cause more flooding and an unacceptable volume of traffic on the already crowded roads. These fields are the only safe areas for families with dogs to walk and children to ride their bikes. I have lived in the area for many years but would seriously consider moving if such a development went ahead. Please look at empty buildings/houses and waste land before removing the last bit of greenery from sections 35-41.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
466968	0	LPCD4060	0	<p>Para 11.3, bullet 3: If the shared requirements for household growth are about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes (as stated in question 1c of the pitifully biased consultation survey you posted out to residents) then surely North Tyneside's share of this would amount to a third of this figure - some 3,500 to 4,000 houses over the next 16 years. According to your own records, as of 30th September 2013 there were 3,473 units that had received planning permission but not started on the build process. Interestingly, this figure did not include the Barratts development on the sites of the former Norgas, George Stephenson and Chan buildings in West Moor, which are also not listed on your plan, despite having been granted planning permission for the construction of over 200 houses. There is also no listing in the records you provided of estimated demolitions where planning permission has not been granted. Even without the inclusion of estimated demolitions, there must be 3,700 units (at the least ) for which planning permission has been granted. If the wording of the consultation survey was accurate, and the shared requirements for growth was between 10,500 and 12,000 new houses, then NT already has granted permission for the majority of this requirement, and thus additional new sites would be required. However, even assuming that the consultation survey was exceptionally poorly worded, and the Council did believe its obligation was to facilitate the construction of between 10,000 and 12,000 homes in the Borough, a simple mathematical calculation shows that the maximum number of new homes required will be between 6,800 and 8,300 new homes. This, of course, does not include the "estimated demolitions" that you claim to have factored into the equation - how many units would this provide and where would they be located? This draft therefore needs to revisit its calculations so that it is not immediately shown up for being inaccurate... Para 11.4: This will be the same Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment process that was incorrectly applied and scored for the Bellway site at Whitehouse Farm (as conceded by the Council's own team during the Planning Appeal in October 2012). I have little faith in the objectivity of this process, as it seems to support the automatic development of greenfield sites already owned by developers, instead of forcing the regeneration and redevelopment of clearly failing industrial estates. Para 11.4 Bullet 2: How do you define "indicated to be surplus"? Surplus to whom - not the communities that enjoy the open vistas</p>	11 Potential Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				<p>and access to countryside and open space such areas provide. This statement directly contradicts the inclusion of sites 3, 4, 109, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 18, 22-28, 35-41, 99, and 101-104. Your inclusion of these sites as potential development sites would, if adopted, ensure that the vast majority of North Tyneside was under concrete, and that all the villages and communities between West Moor and Whitley Bay would become one amorphous, ugly, belt of non-descript mass-produced housing. Not exactly "able to contribute to enhancing open space provision" eh? Para 11.7: "At this point the anticipated phasing for delivery of the land in keeping with the principles set out within this plan to prioritise brownfield land ahead of Greenfield land will be outlined. This will need to additionally take into consideration: The viability of development sites in current and anticipated future market conditions. The requirement to maintain a rolling five year supply of deliverable housing sites."None of the above listed sites are brownfield sites, yet they compromise the bulk of land designated as suitable for potential development. Since I suspect that every developer currently owning these tracts of open land will claim that it is not viable for them to buy or develop brownfield sites, the first "consideration" seems to me to be a licence for developers and the Council to ignore their stated prioritisation principles.</p>	
638471	0	LPCD3722	0	<p>Do the sewers,in the areas where new houses are being built, have the capacity to deal with the extra effluence which will be generated Remember in many places surface water and sewerage share the same drains.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
804849	0	LPCD2779	0	<p>The maps for sites 56,57,58 and 59 appear to be out of date. I refer to the area of land between Union Road and Clifford Street that was formerly the site of the Crescent Industrial Buildings. These have been demolished and the area grassed over. The Fish Quay Neighbourhood Plan SPD expressed the wish that this area should remain as an open space and it should be shown as such on the maps, possibly as a UDP open space as the Neighbourhood Plan SPD had to conform to the UDP. This grassed area is valuable open space, opening up views of Cliffords Fort and the river when one approaches from Tanners Bank and Brewhouse Lane.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
804850	0	LPCD2795	0	<p>No consideration should be given to development for building between Murton and West Monkseaton sites 39,40,41. The road infrastructure in West Monkseaton/Monkseaton cannot cope at present and is a bursting point. Any development around these sites could increase the likelihood of flooding. All developments should be along the A19/A189 corridors which could easily accommodate new slip road access to new developments. Any comments from Northumberland Estates should be disregarded as their prime intention is only to make money and is of no benefit to residents of North Tyneside.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
804902	0	LPCD3178	0	<p>I'd like to strongly object to potentially developing on any Greenbelt sites and specifically sites 35,36,37,38,39,40 &amp; 41, the area around Murton Village. This area is used by a large number of people as an area of tranquillity and safety away from the ever increasing high level of traffic, hustle and bustle which has become a definite problem in North Tyneside. If the areas around Murton Village were to be built upon this would mean that North Tyneside would be one huge conurbation, without places of beauty which are within walking distance for residents to enjoy. To give an example of the</p>	11 Potential Development Sites

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				level of feeling towards this area, please look at planning applications 13/01056/FUL (269 comments, mainly objections) and 12/01644/FUL (63 comments, mainly objections) Apart from the moral issues, building on such a scale would undoubtedly cause other problems to North Tyneside. Can the infrastructure cope with such an increase in the population? Are there sufficient schools and jobs, for example, for the influx of future residents to use? What about flooding problems which coastal households face whenever it rains. Has history not taught us any lessons? Granted we have a wetter climate, but by building on all of our fields, this means that the water has nowhere to go. Traffic congestion is also already a huge problem. Rake Lane in particular is jam packed at regular periods on a daily basis. Building upon the Murton Village area would undoubtedly make this problem worse. Please take a stand and let's leave areas of greenbelt land for future generations to enjoy. It would appear that the government's plan is to simply build themselves out of trouble. This to me would appear very short term thinking, what happens when there is no land left to build upon ?	
804904	0	LPCD2918	0	I wish to object firstly as the information provided is far too high level to pass any sort of judgement. Almost all areas are marked with the same ambiguous purpose for the land.	11 Potential Development Sites
805042	0	LPCD3673	0	Having looked at the proposals, it would appear that there will be no distinct boundaries between areas in North Tyneside. It is going to become one large mass of new houses connecting existing developments.	11 Potential Development Sites
805054	0	LPCD3102	0	Recreational Facilities, encouraging people of all ages to exercise and enjoy themselves are vital for the health of the population. Protection of current leisure and recreational provision is essential and the Council should be providing more facilities not removing the ones already in place.	11 Potential Development Sites
805115	0	LPCD3236	0	Please note my objection to plot 47 being developed (Ice Rink, Young People's Centre and Football Grounds). These facilities are very much used by the local community. It is unthinkable to take so many of this communities local facilities away. The Young People's Centre provides a place for children of all ages to express themselves and to learn and play within a safe environment and is very much loved as it has been for many many years - as are the Football Club and Ice Rink. The resources are very much needed and they help keep our young people in safe and productive environments. The development of this land would be severely detrimental to the community as a whole.	11 Potential Development Sites
805289	0	LPCD3376	0	As a resident overlooking plot 45 I do not wish this site to be developed as the green is a safe haven for most of the local children who use the field for football etc. It is in constant use come rain or shine there must be other more suitable sites further afield the only reason we bought our house was the fact the green was told to us to be common land and would not be developed. I propose plot 22 instead.	11 Potential Development Sites
805309	0	LPCD3410	0	I object to site 47 in particular, but am shocked at how many requests are listed here in the Monkseaton/Whitley Bay Area. There is no need for additional houses to be build. There are plenty of houses available for sale and being built on (nearly all fields near Earsdon & Shiremoor have been	11 Potential Development Sites



**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				turned into housing estates). The current schools cannot support all the additional families as it is. Houses are flooding at the slightest downpour due to lack of flood fields/drainage and there are traffic is getting worse every year. Since when has North Tyneside started to care more about lining the pockets of builders (whether large companies are used or local tradesman is irrelevant here in the long term) to the detriment of the current tax payers? To demolish the ice rink, the football ground and so many other green/social spaces in Whitley Bay is a short sighted, greed driven move and will only hurt the local residents memories and futures. Shame on you.	
805490	0	LPCD3794	0	The C.P.R.E. (campaigning to protect rural England), estimates that half a million homes could be provided by using previously developed land and redeveloping derelict buildings across the country. North Tyneside and all of Tyne and Wear have lost many heavy and light manufacturing industries and is littered with empty factories, offices, business and retail units. In N.Tyneside L.P.C.D.- 8.59 " N.Tyneside has several derelict sites due to its industrial heritage". 5.20 - " In N.Tyneside 210 hectares of land is available for new development " . " 700 hectares of land are in employment use, a proportion is vacant and awaiting new occupiers. The vacant space includes development that has taken place at Quorum and Cobalt business parks where as a result of enterprise zone tax rules offices have been built ahead of demand ". Thus we have in abundance -- brand new, state of art ,highly prestigious developments" built ahead of demand" ready for instant take up. -- Vacant older developments awaiting new occupiers -- At present 210 hectares of land available for new development -- Brownfield derelict sites (employment and retail) across N.T. that could be used for house building.( At present new houses are replacing the derelict Norgas offices and further demolition of redundant buildings is ongoing at Stephenson trading estate , Killingworth creating more sites for new homes). This proves we have sufficient land available for new employment development - 210 hectares for next 15 years.No need for further allocation.Also vast amount of brownfield sites for new homes , retail, employment. No need to build on our greenfields ,good grade agricultural land,wildlife corridors,safeguarded land,open breaks between or within built up area.green belt.The preservation and enhancement of existing natural environment is vital to maintain the high quality image of N.Tyneside to attract investors and tourism (worth £240 million to local economy	11 Potential Development Sites
805508	0	LPCD4433	0	So 'hands off' numbers 16, 17, 18 22 23 24 25 and 26 Also Hands off 35,36,37,38,39,40 and 41. Where will ourselves and our young people be able to breath, appreciate wildlife and flowers and play?	11 Potential Development Sites
805551	0	LPCD3887	0	There should be a general focus on using brownfield sites and consideration for transport. It would be a disaster to use up all the green open spaces in the borough. Many of the roads and the Metro are full to capacity at commuting times, and so care is needed when adding hundreds of new homes where people will need to travel to work and school.	11 Potential Development Sites
805825	0	LPCD4167	0	North Tyneside is heavily over-urbanised as any map of the Borough demonstrates. Whatever the need for new housing there has to come a point where green spaces cannot be developed in order to	11 Potential Development

**RESIDENT COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				protect the quality of life for all existing residents of the borough. No-body wants to live in one giant housing estate and that is what North Tyneside is becoming. It is just not sustainable to keep on developing the green spaces that remain. The impacts on quality of life, the environment and the traffic chaos will no longer make North Tyneside a nice place to live and cause a decline in the area that will result in people leaving, house prices falling and a general increase in levels of deprevation. If development is needed, and there is no reason that it is since there is free movement inwards and outwards of the Borough, the only feasible sites for development can be brown field sites. All green field sites MUST be protected if North Tyneside is to retain any reason for living in the Borough.	Sites
805914	0	LPCD4215	0	I object to 35 -41, 22, 23, 24, 26 & 28, 17 & 18, 46 & 47, 3 & 4. Basically all green spots. Please utilise derelict sites, wasteland, disused car parks and retail parks. The areas that make somewhere nice to live should be protected. Poor drainage and run off are constant problems due to the use of tarmac and concrete and lack of areas that can absorb heavy waterfall. Heed nature and resident wishes. New construction are generally poor quality. If all well built old empty buildings were revamped and used for housing there would probably be enough housing for everyone.	11 Potential Development Sites
589608	0	LPCD6016	0	The potential development sites are all coloured pink. This is not helpful. The Deputy Mayor was meeting with Ice Rink users (TV, January 3rd) because of the uproar around site 47. I know an elderly lady who lives at Charlton Court, site 45, will she be made homeless. The Shiremoor allotment holders, site 33, are similarly up in arms. I wish the pink sites had been differentiated to show Brownland, Greenfield, strong likelihood of development for housing, possible likelihood, remote likelihood.	11 Potential Development Sites
803493	RESIDENT	LPCD3040	0	It is essential that the Plan remains flexible so that housing can be developed in an incremental basis to meet changing needs and that unnecessary large scale infrastructure costs can be avoided where possible. It is also essential for the Council to work closely with Newcastle and Northumberland as the areas are closely interlinked for economic, social, leisure and housing requirements. Close monitoring of changing requirements against pre-set expectations will be necessary to ensure the Council responds to these revised requirements whilst fulfilling the overall objectives of the Plan.	12 Monitoring and Implementation
798761	RESIDENT	LPCD3456	0	I do hope you only build on Greenfield/agricultural land as a last resort ie once all "brownfield" land has been used up. Please use "brownfield" areas for development i.e. practice, please, what politicians preach restore electors trust.	12 Monitoring and Implementation
					12.1

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6702	0	<p>As part of these representations we have reviewed the sustainability appraisal work undertaken by the Council in relation to each of the specific sites being considered for potential development. The sites promoted by BPL include site references 23, 24, 25 and 26. We have noted a series of in principle objections to the strategy being promoted by the Council in the paragraphs above although have concern at the transparency with which the Council has undertaken the sustainability appraisal of the potential development site. The sustainability appraisal scope identifies 20 broad criteria by which each site has been assessed although there is no quantitative assessment criteria which can be reviewed as part of these representations and the outcomes appear to be subjective in nature. As part of the demonstration of the suitability of the BPL land, a feasibility study is currently being prepared which will demonstrate the relative sustainability of the site, having regard to access to a range of existing services and facilities, and those which can also be accommodated within any Services and facilities within Killingworth, including schools for all age groups, shops, employment opportunities etc (within 2.5 km of the site); and, Employment opportunities at, Whitley Road (within 0.5 km of the site), Cobalt Business Park (within 3 km of the site) and other surrounding areas which are easily accessible via the A19 Trunk Road. It should also be noted that the BPL land does not form part of the designated Green Belt (nor is it subject to any other environmental protection designations) and with a carefully masterplanned development the site can be developed in a manner which will not adversely affect the surrounding landscape and will continue to protect the nearby Green Belt. Overall, the emerging feasibility study will demonstrate the physical capacity and suitability of the site for a new sustainable community over the emerging plan period. It will also confirm the site can be viably developed to create a 'sustainable community', including uses other than residential, which is a significant benefit to releasing this area of Safeguarded Land. future development. Amongst other things, existing services and facilities include: Immediate access to Palmersville Metro Station which provides connections to Newcastle City Centre and other areas beyond (within SOM of the site);</p>	1 Introduction
396220	COUNCILLOR	North Tyneside Council	LPCD5984	0	<p>The timing of the consultation is unsatisfactory, as it covers the Christmas season, and the period allowed for responses is inadequate. We asked at a meeting of full Council for the period to be extended but the Mayor and the Labour councillors rejected this request. During the Christmas and New Year holidays, and the time immediately before them, residents are very busy and</p>	1 Introduction

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					thus less likely to have time to notice and consider properly the proposals in the Plan, which have wide ranging implications.	
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6569	0	<p>Duty to co-operate: The LPA’s approach as set out in this Consultation Draft is to provide for a level of housing development below that of population projections. This is based on an assumption that Newcastle and Northumberland will see lower levels of out-migration to North Tyneside and as such the population projections are higher than the expected reality. Notwithstanding the flaws in this approach, which are outlined throughout these representations, in order for this to be found sound at Examination there needs to be evidence of substantial co-operation between the neighbouring authorities. From the evidence put forward in this iteration of the NTL, and based upon an ongoing involvement with Newcastle and Northumberland’s plans, there doesn’t appear to have been an adequate level of co-operation between the LPA’s to substantiate North Tyneside’s approach. Whilst it is acknowledged that a Memorandum of Understanding has been agreed between 7 North East Councils, this is not considered sufficient to meet the Duty to Co-operate. It is important that local authorities demonstrate and evidence how this co-operation has influenced the formulation of policies and strategic aims within the plan. It is worth reiterating recent Government guidance on this matter which states “it is unlikely that this (the duty) can be satisfied by consultation alone”<sup>1</sup> and that “inspectors will assess the outcomes of the co-operation and not just whether local planning authorities have approached others”<sup>2</sup>. In recent examinations inspectors have raised concerns over conformity with the Duty, specifically noting that compliance with the duty needs to go beyond consultation with neighbouring authorities “actions need to be implemented and evidence provided of high level agreements to tackle strategic issues. Indeed Newcastle / Gateshead’s Core Strategy is due to be examined later this year and as such this issue is likely to be assessed in detail. It is advised that a more formal arrangement for the Duty is agreed upon prior to this to strengthen both North Tyneside’s Local Plan and the Newcastle /Gateshead Core Strategy. In this instance it is recommended that evidence is produced to justify the assumption that out migration from Newcastle and Northumberland into North Tyneside will decrease over the plan period to level capable of justifying such a substantial reduction in proposed housing numbers. Plan Preparation It is acknowledged that much of the consultation work undertaken relating to the Core Strategy can be brought forward and utilised as a base for</p>	1 Introduction

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>the Local Plan. However, primary consultation needs to be undertaken on aspects of the NTLP which were not consulted upon through the Core Strategy process “ Development Management policies for example. It is somewhat surprising to see that the adoption timetable at paragraph 1.42 proposes a Publication Draft as the next published stage of the plan followed by submission to the Secretary of State 13 months from now. Taking into account that this iteration of the NTLP doesn’t specify the Authorities preferred level of growth or sites for development (as stated in paragraph 1.43), the above timescales are considered to be overly optimistic. Plan Period: In light of the above it is recommended that a more suitable plan period is proposed based on the likely adoption of the plan being post 2015. In this context it is worth reiterating the fact that the evidence base for the NTLP must be up-to-date when taken to examination “ this is set out in the NPPF and through numerous recent Inspectors’ reports at examination.</p>	
408348	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	The Coal Authority	LPCD4077	0	<p>Test of Soundness Positively Prepared- Yes Justified - Yes Effective - Yes Consistency to NPPF - Yes Legal &amp; Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - Yes Support “ In broad overall terms The Coal Authority has found the Local Plan to be well structured, effective and justified in its approach. It builds successfully on the previous consultation exercises and takes due cognisance of representations we have made previously which is to be welcomed.</p>	1 Introduction
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6130	0	<p>Paragraph 1.10 “ here and elsewhere, including the heading of Section 9 of the Plan, consideration of the “historic” environment is subsumed within a broad-brush reference to the “built” environment. Although implicit where references are made to the built environment, English Heritage would wish the Plan to be more explicit as regards the historic environment.</p>	1 Introduction
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes (Newcastle)	LPCD6006	0	<p>The Plan period is set to run for 15 years, which seems appropriate. However, housing requirements etc. are planned over 17 years from 2013-2030. Based on the fact that the Plan will not be adopted until November 2015 at the earliest, we would be keen for the Plan period to run from 2015/16 “ 2030/31; the NPPF prefers Plans to have a 15 year period post adoption. Taking into account over 2 years that will already have passed before the Plan is adopted will affect the deliverability of the Plan and viability of housing numbers/allocations proposed. Although the Vision 2030 is positive, it fails to provide spatial emphasis or set out an overall development framework for North Tyneside. The Council must ensure that vision provides a clear and coherent planning strategy</p>	1 Introduction

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>for the future of the area. It also fails to mention living in the borough “                      “We want North Tyneside to be a place of opportunity, prosperity and vibrancy; a place where people are happy, healthy, safe, able to participate in a flourishing economy and achieve their full potential”™. (Perhaps “able to participate in a flourishing economy, live in sustainable communities and achieve their full potential”™) The consultation that has taken place on the Local Plan is appropriate. However we would urge the Council to clearly identify what the outcome was; the issues raised; and how they have informed the policy. This will help demonstrate that the Plan being developed is genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, by preparing the Plan in consultation with the local community at each stage. BDW are also pleased to hear that the five Tyne and Wear authorities have met throughout the formation of the Plan to share and respond to any issues; alongside a shared approach on evidence base documents and the development of a Memorandum of Understanding considered by the Cabinet in November 2013 (an agreement between 7 authorities on how they comply with the Duty to Co-operate) which is encouraging. North Tyneside Council have also considered the role of the North East LEP and combined authority (LA7) which is positive given the growing prominence the LEP will have over the Plan period. We are pleased to see that in line with the national planning policy, the preparation of the Local Plan has been informed by the consideration of wider policy, consideration of how it fits into the wider strategy: “ Government policy statements, guidance and circulars “ Evidence developed by North East LEP and now revoked RSS where the evidence is still relevant “ North Tyneside Council Plan “Out North Tyneside 2014 to 2018”™ and evidence produced/commissioned by North Tyneside Council to inform plan (SHMAA or Green Infrastructure Strategy) This demonstrates that the Council has taken into account how the Plan will work/relate to other policies operating nationally, regionally and locally, creating a Plan which is well evidenced and justified. 16. Duty to Co-operate We recognise that the Council has fulfilled the Duty to Co-operate, a statutory requirement for the Plan to be found sound. However, it is not sufficient to simply implement the Duty the Council must clearly illustrate the issues raised from discussions etc. and how these, as well of the “Memorandum of Understanding”™ produced between the 7 North East Local Authorities have helped shaped the plan preparation. The requirement to demonstrate clear agreements and actions from the Duty to Co-operate is set out in the National</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). “It is unlikely that this (the duty) can be satisfied by consultation alone” “Inspectors will assess outcomes of co-operation and not just whether local planning authorities have approached others”. The Council should produce a background paper highlighting how the discussions and procedures put in place as part of the Duty to Co-operate have influenced the preparation of the Plan. One aspect that needs to be clarified in the Plan is the requirement set out in Policy S/7.2. Policy S/7.2 wishes to provide less than its objectively assessed housing need through co-operation with Newcastle upon Tyne and Northumberland. Neither Northumberland nor Newcastle (which is at an advanced stage in the preparation of the Plan) has indicated to date that they would be willing or able to take any unmet housing need from North Tyneside. The Council needs to agree this with the neighbouring authorities, evidencing any discussions that have taken place and the resulting actions. Without sufficient evidence that the Duty to Co-operate has been fulfilled the Plan could be found unsound at examination. The Kirkless Core Strategy had to be withdrawn, as despite regular discussions with neighbouring authorities, there was no substantive evidence that the Council had met its duty as it had merely discussed existing plans. The Council had intended to reduce the housing requirement from the objectively assessed need.</p> <p>17. Sustainability Appraisal We consider the matrix derived was an appropriate way in which to test the policies against the 20 Sustainability Appraisal objectives, whilst considering their effects over time, how to mitigate against any negative effects and consider alternative approaches. BDW were pleased that the Council had pitched and scored each policy and site against each of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>18. Recommendations To summarise, BDW has produced list of recommendations for the Council to consider before the plan is submitted to Cabinet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“ Run the Plan period from 2015/16 “ 2030/31</li> <li>“ The Council should provide a spatial element and consider including a reference to “living” in North Tyneside in their Vision 2030</li> <li>“ Identify the outcome of the consultation “ the issues raised and how they have informed policy</li> <li>“ Alter the wording of Policy DM/2.2 and S/7.1 to encourage the use of brownfield land, not prioritise it</li> <li>“ Revise the Green Belt to make it more flexible and conduct a review of the Green Belt</li> <li>“ The Council must ensure that this review safeguards sufficient land which endures well beyond the Plan period. Triggers should be introduced to activate a full or partial review of the Plan</li> <li>“ Consider the implications of this policy on viability and consider funding</li> </ul>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>this requirement through CIL or New Homes Bonus instead – Clarify the housing target – the Council must either plan to deal with the objectively assessed housing need itself or receive formal agreement from neighbouring authorities that they will pick up additional housing need – Review the gross housing target calculation and consider whether it is realistic to think all existing permissions/applications minded to grant will be brought forward and whether they have identified sufficient sites and adequately planned for the outstanding gross housing target – Review Table 2: Gross Housing Targets 2013/14 to 2029/30, p73 of the Plan for typing errors – Add a 20% buffer to be moved forward from later in the Plan – Base housing requirements on the most up to date projections possible, using the updated SHMA currently being conducted as a key piece of evidence base – Consider introducing additional sites outside of the main area to provide additional flexibility to ensure successful delivery of housing – Introduce a Plan, Monitor, Manage approach which introduces measures to assist the delivery of sites if they do not come forward – Conduct a comprehensive review of the Green Belt to identify further sites – The Council must evaluate whether a 25% affordable housing requirement is truly delivery or whether it will stall sites/developments – Provide more details on their working with North Tyneside Homes to deliver 2,500 – 3,000 new Council Homes and clarification on whether such a proposal will come forward – Delete the prescriptive Policy DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size or if retained make it more flexible and simply make reference to having regard to the SHMA – Deal with improvements to deficiencies in infrastructure provision through CIL contributions – The Council must consider the impact seeking to maximise the contribution from developers for infrastructure will have on the viability of sites and deliverability of housing targets – Reword Policy S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding to reflect that the impact on viability will be considered and the contribution sought will not impact on the deliverability of the site – A background paper highlighting how the discussion and procedures put in place as part of the Duty to Co-operate have influenced the preparation of the Plan</p>	
546048	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Port of Tyne	LPCD5133	0	<p>In response to your consultation on the above we have reviewed the document together with our client, the Port of Tyne Authority, in the context of their land holdings on the north bank of the River Tyne. As a result of this exercise we have a number of representations to make on behalf of the Port for the consideration of the local planning authority. These representations are set out below for your</p>	1 Introduction



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>consideration but in the first instance the Port would like to express its support for the emerging Local Plan which seeks to plan for the future development of North Tyneside . There have already been a series of discussions held between the Port and representatives of the Council regarding the Port's own proposals for development on the north bank of the Tyne over the short, medium and long term. The Port is, therefore, keen to ensure that its plans are supported in the final Local Plan document together with its ongoing operational requirements. Essentially, the Port wishes the document to strike the balance between promoting new economic initiatives in the Borough, including the North East Low Carbon Enterprise Zone, whilst at the same time supporting existing economic development in the area. This approach is generally adopted in the Port of Tyne Local Development Order, including the North Shields Ferry Terminal, which acknowledges the Port's existing permitted development rights.</p>	
808367	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	G Oliver	LPCD5695	0	<p>The following paragraphs set out our client's (Mr G Oliver) comments in respect of this section. The 'Duty to Co-operate' is introduced in section 1.20 of the Consultation Document. In order to comply with this North Tyneside Council must be able to demonstrate that it has co-operated diligently with its neighbouring local planning authorities on strategic priorities as set out in NPPF (156) including the provision of new homes and jobs. This joint work must be collaborative, properly co-ordinated and a continuous process of engagement, clearly reflected in the Local Plan (NPPF 179). Section 1.23 states that the Council has been working with adjoining local authorities and other public bodies in the preparation of the plan and in doing so, a 'Memorandum of Understanding' has been established. It further states that 'potential opportunities provided by close working relationships between the authorities... will have an important strategic role, influencing particularly the economy, skills and transport across the area'. However there is little reference or evidence of this provided throughout the consultation document, specifically with regard to housing requirements. The Consultation Document (S/7.2 Housing Figures) indicates that some of the North Tyneside housing requirements are likely to be met by provision made within Northumberland and Newcastle. However the housing requirements detailed within Northumberland's latest Consultation Document (October 2013) do not make reference to any strategic issues arising from Newcastle or North Tyneside or any proportion of housing requirements arising in North Tyneside being met in Northumberland. It can therefore be concluded that Northumberland's housing requirement does not allow for</p>	1 Introduction

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					provision for any of North Tyneside's housing requirements. Consequently the proposed reduction in housing delivery set out within S/7.2 to 'between 10,500 and 12,000 homes' will not meet the North Tyneside's housing requirements. Further clarification is required regarding the potential cross boundary implications of meeting objectively assessed housing needs arising in neighbouring local authority areas. To enable the process of the plan preparation to be considered sound, it should be clearly demonstrated specifically that the Duty to Co-operate has been substantively and therefore lawfully engaged.	
805832	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4157	0	1.17 – 1.25 The plan should emphasise the sustainable priorities of the 7 Local Authorities. They should create a North East Local Environment Partnership and Combined Authority. The language of 'Duty to Co-operate' should be overwhelmed by a 'Desire to Co-operate'. The emphasis on what CAN we do rather than what must we do.	1 Introduction
396306	LOCAL AUTHORITY	South Tyneside Council,	LPCD2493	0	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 preparation of your development plan in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate requirements and the LA7 Memorandum of Understanding. 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 emerging Local Enterprise Partnership and Combined Authority proposals. 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 or on its accompanying Policies Map of the cross-river pedestrian-cycle tunnels that are currently undergoing a major refurbishment programme.	1 Introduction
685112	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Sport England	LPCD2716	0	Evidence Base for Sport The NPPF explains that Local Planning Authorities should set out the strategic priorities for the area, including strategic policies to deliver (inter alia) the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities Paragraph 171 falls within the section of the NPPF that sets out advice on the evidence base that Plans need, and deals with Health and Well-Being. It advises; "Local planning authorities should work with public health leads and health organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the local population (such as for sports, recreation, and places of worship), including expected future changes	1 Introduction

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>and any information about relevant barriers to improving health and well-being. This advice is amplified in the section of the NPPF that deals with promoting healthy communities. Paragraph 73 states; "Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up to date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required." In light of the above, it is Sport England's policy to challenge the soundness of Local Plan and Local Development Framework documents which are not justified by; -an up to date playing pitch strategy (carried out in accordance with a methodology approved by Sport England) -an up to date built sports facilities strategy (carried out in accordance with a methodology approved by Sport England). For a playing pitch strategy to be considered "up to date", it should have been undertaken within the last three years. For a built facilities strategy to be considered "up to date" it should have been carried out within the last five years. In North Tyneside's case the Playing Pitch Strategy was carried out in the last year, but there is no equivalent strategy dealing with built sports facilities. It is Sport England's policy to challenge the soundness of development plan documents which do not an appropriate evidence base for sport, and the absence of strategy covering built sports will need to be rectified before the Local Plan reaches submission stage.</p>	
755686	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4584	0	<p>It is recognised that the plan is still at a relatively early stage of development and the Council has yet to specify its preferred level of growth or sites for development. The comments provided below are therefore intended to be constructive and assist the Council in achieving a sound plan. The following comments are based upon the significant experience of the HBF in dealing with local plan examinations. Paragraph 1.20: Duty to co-operate The Council's acknowledgement that housing is a strategic issue which requires consideration through the duty to co-operate is welcome. In addition the regional work in producing a "Memorandum of Understanding" between the seven north east authorities is also encouraging. It is, however, important that the Council clearly illustrates how any discussions as well as the memorandum have helped</p>	1 Introduction

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>shape plan preparation. The need for clear agreements and actions is particularly relevant to North Tyneside given the indication in Policy S/7.2 that it wishes to provide less than its objectively assessed housing need through co-operation with Newcastle upon Tyne and Northumberland. It is noted that neither Northumberland nor Newcastle upon Tyne, the latter of whom is at an advanced stage of plan preparation, have yet identified that they would be willing or able to take any unmet housing need from North Tyneside. The importance of demonstrating agreement upon this issue cannot be underestimated. The recent withdrawal of Kirklees Core Strategy bears testimony to this. Kirklees had intended to reduce its housing requirement from its objectively assessed need and despite holding regular discussions with neighbouring authorities the inspector in this case could find no substantive evidence that the Council had met its duty as it had merely discussed existing plans. The draft National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) is also clear on the need to identify actions and states “it is unlikely that this (the duty) can be satisfied by consultation alone” and that “inspectors will assess the outcomes of the co-operation and not just whether local planning authorities have approached others” It is therefore recommended that prior to the next stage of consultation the Council produces a background paper highlighting how the discussions and procedures put in place have influenced the preparation of the plan. Plan Period The plan period of 15 years post adoption up to 2030 is generally considered appropriate. It is, however, noted that the anticipated adoption of the plan is not expected until November 2015 at the earliest and that paragraph 1.44 of the plan indicates the timescale for adoption may slip. Given this uncertainty and the NPPF preference for a 15 year time horizon, post adoption, the Council should consider extending the plan period to 2031 or beyond.</p>	
805135	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	North Tyneside Green Party	LPCD3380	0	<p>1. Introduction and Green Party approach 1.1 The Green Party of North Tyneside has considered the draft Local Plan and welcomes various aspects of the objectives of Local Plan including: o More quality affordable homes o Reduction in CO2 and other greenhouse gases and mitigation of impact of climate change o Promotion of the renewable energy sector and improving the Borough’s resilience to the effects of climate change o Recognition of the importance of open space in promoting health and active lifestyles o Protection of the natural environment o Prioritising brownfield sites for housing and economic development 1.2. However we are not convinced that the Sustainable</p>	1 Introduction

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>Development Strategy for North Tyneside, as described in the Plan, provides an adequate framework for delivering these objectives from the Green Party perspective. 1.3. The Green Party approach would aim to maintain and enhance the natural as well as the human environment of the borough, ensuring that whatever development was required to provide for the population would not be done at the expense of wildlife and bio-diversity. Easy access to the natural environment is important for people’s overall wellbeing and should not be considered just as providing opportunities for exercise and leisure time activity. In relation to the above objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Reducing the carbon footprint of the borough would include exploring and encouraging community-based sources of alternative energy as well as encouraging local food production in order to reduce transport miles.</li> <li>o Waste recycling would include not just the collection and sorting of the borough’s waste – including food waste (collected by many local authorities now) to generate energy – but also the encouragement of local enterprises to turn the waste into useful products. The council could give a lead in the use of products created from such secondary resources.</li> <li>o What housing development is required should supplement existing urban centres but also contain all the facilities necessary to enable all residents to access what they need with the minimal use of private transport – shops, schools, play areas, resources for the less mobile, public transport.</li> <li>o Housing should also be built with an eye to the longterm – carbon neutral, homes-for-life – so that people would have reduced energy use and would not need to move home when their mobility declined. Where new housing is required provision needs to be made for older residents, most of whom will never need either sheltered housing or residential care, but who will want to be near local facilities to meet their needs.</li> <li>o Economic growth should be prioritised in terms of providing employment and improving the quality of life rather than further exploiting environmental resources eg ensuring the insulation of all homes in the borough, re-using waste mineral resources (from old cars, white goods etc)</li> </ul>	
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6687	0	<p>Banks Property Ltd (hereafter referred to as 'BPL ). BPL is part of the Banks Group which has more than 30 years experience in the north east of delivering sensitive developments in minerals, renewable energy and mixed use regeneration schemes. BPL are promoting a major land holding to the north of Palmersville and east of Killingworth, identified as 'Safeguarded Land' (saved Policy E21) within the existing North Tyneside Unitary Development Plan (2002).</p>	1 The Local Plan

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>It is considered that the land promoted by BPL is capable of delivering a significant quantum of housing over the emerging plan period, as well as various other land uses to create a new sustainable community. In this respect, delivery of the site will assist the Council in achieving its strategic objectives and compliance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. Identification of this site within the emerging plan will address some of the issues identified in these representations. Overall there is a fundamental objection to the Council's strategy which does not accommodate its 'full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing'. As currently drafted it is considered that the Plan fails the relevant tests of soundness and must be amended before submission for examination. The relevant tests of soundness are set out at paragraph 182 of the Framework and are as follows:                       • Positively prepared;                       • Justified;                       • Effective; and                       • Consistent with national policy.</p>	
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6703	0	<p>Overall it is considered that the emerging Local Plan contains many positive aspects which can be carried forward through future consultation. However, there is a fundamental concern in respect of the Council's strategy which does not accommodate its full, objectively assessed housing requirements over the plan period and the likely significant negative impacts this will have on the overall deliverability of the plan if the approach is found sound, or the more likely outcome that the approach is considered unsound during examination. The fundamental objections can be summarised as follows: 1. Objective to displace up to 35% of the full objectively assessed housing needs. This should be accommodated in full within the Borough and there is no evidence that other authorities can accommodate the balance; 2. The policy to 'prioritise the use of brownfield land'; and 3. The likely effect of the above points in being able to deliver both market and affordable housing needs. In this regard we urge the Council to reconsider its approach to housing delivery over the plan period and specifically identify sites to deliver the full objectively assessed housing requirement, including the release of areas of safeguarded land for development over the plan period. We trust these representations will be duly considered as part of the plan preparation process and look forward to future engagement with the Council as part of the emerging plan process.</p>	1 The Local Plan
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6560	0	<p>Although English Heritage has commented more recently on the area-specific action plans for Wallsend, North Shields, and the Coast, it is two or three years since we were consulted on what was then described as the Core Strategy for</p>	1 The Local Plan

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>the Borough. In the meantime, this being the case, the conservation of the historic environment, and the way in which Local Plans are required to deal with the matter has since been clarified and strengthened through the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF requires Local Plans to enable the delivery of sustainable development, one of the core dimensions of which is the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 7). 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 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). As general observation, English Heritage considers the draft Plan to contain much that would enable the Council to positively and pro-actively conserve the historic environment of the Borough, and to this extent it is to be congratulated on the content of the Plan thus far.</p>	
805724	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Horton Estate	LPCD4072	0	<p>In conclusion Horton Estate welcome the Plan and look forward to positive discussions with the Council on the issues arising.</p>	1 The Local Plan
808279	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Bett Homes	LPCD5625	0	<p>These representations are submitted by Signet Planning on behalf of Bett Homes. Bett Homes are currently involved in an appeal against North Tyneside Council's refusal of planning permission on the former Hadrian Park First School site at Addington Drive, Wallsend (LPA Ref: 12/02047/FUL) which is programmed to be considered at Public Enquiry from 28th January 2014, and as such have a vested interest in the emergin plan. In addition to the representations submitted as part of this letter Bett Homes are also a member of the Home Builders Federation and support the representations made by the HBF. Overall there is a fundamental objection to the Council's strategy which does not accommodate its "full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing". As currently drafted it is considered that the Plan fails the relevant test of soundndess and must be amended before submission for examination. The relevant test of soundness are set out at paragraph 182 of the</p>	1 The Local Plan

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>Framework and are as follows: - Positively prepared; - Justified; -Effective; and, - Consistent with national policy. In summary There is fundamental concern in respect of the Council's strategy which does not accommodate its full, objectively assessed housing requirements over the plan period and the likely significant negative impacts this will have on the overall deliverability of the Plan if the approach is found sound, or the more likely outcome that the approach is considered unsound during examination. The emerging approach is not in conformity with the NPPF in regard to its approach to housing delivery over the plan period and specifically identify sites to deliver the full objectively assessed housing requirement, neither does it conform with the NPPF in regards to green/open space considerations. We trust these representations will be duly considered as part of the plan preparation process and look forward to future engagement with the Council as part of the emerging plan process. (See also attached letter from Signet Planning on behalf of Bett Homes.)</p>	
807052	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Newcastle Green Party	LPCD4731	0	<p>I write to submit the formal objection from Newcastle Green Party to the North Tyneside development. Our members think it does not constitute sustainable development. It would degrade both the local environment and local community fabric whilst not delivering necessary social and economic improvements. We are especially concerned about the severe threat to biodiversity within and beyond North Tyneside contained within the plan's proposals. We call for its radical revision. We call for a much stronger emphasis on the redevelopment of the existing built-up area with special focus on derelict brownfield sites. 4. There is insufficient effort to cater for the needs of public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. 5. The plan takes little account of what other local authorities are seeking to build. This contradicts the spirit if not the letter of the Localism Act. 6. In sum, the plan cannot be said to embody the principles of sustainable development since, in toto, they would, if fully implemented, leave local communities in a less socially, economically and environmentally sustainable condition. The plan has not been positively prepared, cannot be justified and will be ineffective in meeting the likely challenges ahead.</p>	1 The Local Plan
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6648	0	<p>The Trust want to work with the Council in formulating the plan for North Tyneside in respect of their landholdings and are also keen to ensure the plan properly reflects the importance of the provision of quality healthcare for the North Tyneside populous. The Trust also consider it is important to reflect the significance of the employment opportunities the Trust provide for the Borough.</p>	1 The Local Plan
805649	NATIONAL/RE	Age UK North	LPCD6577	0	<p>1. Background – demographic change and its significance Age UK North</p>	1 The Local



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Tyneside			<p>Tyneside welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Council's draft Local Plan. We believe that the Plan has the potential to significantly contribute to making North Tyneside a place where older people chose to live, work and enjoy a good quality of life. We live in a society that is undergoing fundamental demographic change. In 2007 the number of people aged 60 and over outnumbered the numbers of children under 18 for the first time in our history.<sup>1</sup> The numbers of people aged 60 and over is projected to keep on increasing over the next 20 years as life expectancy continues to improve. Whilst the growth in the numbers of older people in North Tyneside is predicted to be slightly less than the national average it is still significant as is shown in the graph below. There is a particularly significant growth in the numbers of very old people i.e. those aged 85 and over. Between 2012 and 2020 the number will increase by 23% from 4,800 to 5,900. (POPPI) The House of Lords Select Committee on Public Service and Demographic Change in a report published in March 2013<sup>2</sup> highlighted the extent to which both Government as a whole and society is unprepared to deal with the implications of this change. In 2004 the RTPI pointed out that; "The implications of the ageing of the UK's population are huge. They will affect every aspect of our lives, individually and socially."<sup>3</sup> In 2008 the, then, Government issued guidance which highlighted the fact that population ageing needed to be a fundamental consideration in sustainable planning.<sup>4</sup></p> <p>2. The draft North Tyneside Local Plan We support the Vision for 2030 and the 12 strategic objectives for the Plan set out in paragraph 3.4. We note that these are high level objectives and will need more detailed consideration. For example what is meant by "sustainable development" and "sustainable communities" and how will the needs, wishes and contribution of older people be addressed through these notions? However the draft local Plan and supporting documentation does not, as far as we can see, effectively address the challenges posed by the changing demography of the Borough. The "Consultation Draft" only mentions older people ("the elderly") in the context of a requirement for specialist housing. But only a minority of people aged 65 and over live in non-mainstream housing. For example in North Tyneside fewer than 5% of people aged 65 and over live in a care home (source: POPPI). The background paper on "Housing and Population" looks at overall population projections but fails to mention the changing demographic profile of the borough. The Local Plan sets out the following key strategic priorities: i, The homes and jobs needed in the Borough.</p>	Plan

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>                     i. Retail, leisure and other commercial development. i. Infrastructure provision for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water, flood risk, coastal change, minerals and energy. i. Provision of health facilities, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities. i. Climate change mitigation and adaption. i. Conservation and enhancement of natural and built environment. The needs of older people are an important consideration in a number of these: i. As stated above the vast majority of older people live in mainstream housing. They contribute significantly to the sustainability of local communities and are a major sector of the housing market. i. Notwithstanding this many older people do live in accommodation that may not be suitable for their needs either because of its size, often too large, location, e.g. away from shops and local services, or unsuitability because of lack of accessibility etc. Unsuitable housing has a significant cost not just to the older person themselves but to society as a whole in terms of increased need for health and social care e.g.as a result of falls, illnesses arising from or exacerbated by damp and poor heating etc. Much recent new build has often not been suitable for older people as it is often dominated by flats and “starter” homes. i. There is a growing need for a range of specialist housing options for older people including new forms such as co-housing, leasehold retirement housing. Traditional forms such as bungalows and one-bed roomed sheltered flats are increasingly recognised as no longer being people’s preferred options. i. Growing numbers of older people are choosing (or compelled) to continue working after pensionable age. The concept of a fixed retirement age is seen as increasingly 4 anachronistic. As the state pension age rises in line with increased life expectancy these numbers will continue to increase. Older people are also important in supporting younger parents to participate in the labour market by providing unpaid child care. i. Older people form an increasingly important sector of the retail and leisure markets. Many (but by no means all) older people do have significant disposable income and how they spend this will be an important factor in shaping these sectors. i. As a group older people are more reliant on public transport, especially people with reduced mobility and those on low incomes. The development of a good local transport infrastructure is vital to help people remain independent and be able to make good use of local services. Isolation is a growing problem amongst older people leading to depression and poor health. i. Older people are major users of local health, care and support services. Ready access to these services is crucial in helping to maintain health and wellbeing                 </p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>and support older people to be less reliant on more intensive and expensive services in the long-run. i. Older people are not only users of local services they often form the backbone of local community infrastructure and support. ii. For people who re retired their residential location is no longer constrained by employment location but will be influenced by a range of other influences including access to services, transport, cost of living, quality of life and the need to adjust to growing older. 3. Responding to demographic change The Council's spatial policies and plans need to reflect all of these factors. We think this needs to include: i. A full understanding of the impact of demographic change across the borough including detailed consideration of the age structure and recognition of the different requirements of groups within the older population. ii. In relation to housing moving away from an assumption that the main issue is the provision of specialist housing to an understanding of how the needs of the majority of older people can best be ne met through mainstream housing provision. This is in line with the policy of successive government's emphasising the importance of supporting people to live independently in their own homes for as long as possible based on the concept of lifetime homes. iii. As regards specialist housing promoting greater diversity in the marketplace e.g. housing for younger retired people, new forms of development such as extra-care 5 and co-housing, and ensuring that specialist provision is integrated into the community. iv. Adopting a policy of creating "lifetime" or "age-friendly" neighbourhoods i.e. ensuring the creation of mixed communities with a variety of housing provision and range of public and private services, amenities, space and infrastructure that cater for the needs of all life stages in a single area. v. Ensuring that the development of town centres, retail facilities, employment opportunities are accessible to a wide range of people with good public transport links. The primary purpose of the Local Plan is to set out a framework for the sustainable growth and development of North Tyneside over the next 15 years. During the timescale of the Plan the proportion of the population aged 65 and over will continue to grow from its current level of just over 18% towards making up 25% of the population of the Borough. Any strategy for sustainable development of the Borough must take proper account of such a large segment of the population. At Age UK North Tyneside we are committed to working with the Council and other partners to help ensure this is the case. (See attached graphs for more detail)</p>	
510094	NATIONAL/RE	Natural England	LPCD6748	0	Map 1 correctly identifies the Northumbria Coast Ramsar nature conservation	1 The Local

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	GIONAL/ORGANISATION				<p>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 internationally protected nature conservation sites.</p> <p>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 Local Plan.</p>	Plan
510094	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Natural England	LPCD6749	0	<p>Duty to Co-operate</p> <p>Natural England welcomes the identification of conservation and enhancement of the natural environment as a cross boundary issue and the commitment to work with neighbouring authorities and Natural England to address those that arise.</p> <p>The supporting Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) must examine whether the local plan will effect Natura 2000 sites in combination with neighbouring plans. North Tyneside and it’s neighbouring authorities should, in accordance with the duty to co operate, ensure that in combination effects are assessed through their respective HRAs and, if identified, ensure adverse effects on integrity are avoided or mitigated (please see NE’s advice regarding the HRA’s analysis of in-combination effects).</p>	0
789566	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Environment Agency	LPCD5341	0	<p>We would recommend that the environmental picture of North Tyneside includes reference to the importance of the water environment. The River Tyne supports the best stocks of salmon in England and Wales as well as a substantial run of sea trout. North Tyneside’s Bathing Water Beaches provide a valuable recreational amenity and benefit for the local economy.</p>	2 A Picture of North Tyneside
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6688	0	<p>The overall objectives of the emerging plan are welcomed, particularly with regard to the aspiration to diversify, strengthen and grow the local economy (Objective 2) and provide an appropriate range and choice of housing to meet current and future needs (Objective 4). However, as set out against later considerations of the Plan within these representations, the two objectives are mutually dependent and one cannot be achieved without the other (ie. in order to achieve the aspirations of Objective 2, there must be sufficient housing provided in accordance with the 'objectively assessed needs'). Furthermore, it is considered that draft Objective 4 is not sufficiently clear in terms of its</p>	3 Vision and Objectives

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					conformity with the Framework and it should state that the Council will meet its 'full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing'. If this is not the case then clear justification, and commitment from adjoining authorities to accommodate additional housing will need to be provided as part of the plan.	
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4648	0	Objectives With regards to Objective 4 (providing an appropriate range and choice of housing need to meet current and future needs), reference should be made to the economic role that new housing development serves in terms of supporting economic growth and creating jobs.	3 Vision and Objectives
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6610	0	Objectives: 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 housebuilding 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 housebuilding 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 â€” a figure which is likely to rise as the market strengthens. Objective 4 appears to be in conflict with one of the main purposes of Local Plans as set out in para. 47 of the NPPF â€” to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. The proposed objective proposes an â€”appropriateâ€” range of housing to meet needs â€” Persimmon would argue that in order to comply with the NPPF the only â€”appropriateâ€” figure to provide is that of the full, objectively assessed need for the borough.	3 Vision and Objectives
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6132	0	Paragraph 3.2 â€” it is noticeable that the vision and objectives of the Council Plan, Our North Tyneside â€” 2014 to 2018, as set out here make no overt reference to the historic environment. Paragraph 3.4 â€” I welcome the inclusion of Objective 9 which deals in large measure with the conservation of the historic environment. I also welcome a number of other Objectives focusing on issues which would/could additionally address heritage conservation matters through their achievement.	3 Vision and Objectives
789566	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Environment Agency	LPCD5342	0	Given the value of North Tynesideâ€™s water environment we recommend that objective 9 â€”Protect and enhance the natural environmentâ€” is amended to include such provisions for the water environment. We consider this is of particular necessary due to the Water Framework Directive (WFD). WFD is	3 Vision and Objectives

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>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 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 Letch, the Seaton Burn and the Brierdene.</p>	
396325	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4387	0	<p>Objective 1 of the Local Plan states that North Tyneside will develop and promote approaches to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to adapt to, and mitigate the impact of, climate change, including inter alia "ensuring the highest standards in resource and energy efficiency are adopted". As currently worded NWL considers that this objective is unclear as it does not define the energy standards that developments will have to achieve. Furthermore, requiring developments to adopt the 'highest standards' may make such developments unviable. Having regards to paragraphs 95 and 96 of the NPPF, it is recommended that the wording of Objective 1 is amended as follows:"promoting the renewable energy sector and developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption" [ suggest that the following text be deleted....ensuring the highest standards in resource and energy efficiency are adopted...end of deletion] 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</p>	3 Vision and Objectives

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					during the plan period ... "	
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4587	0	Objective 1 of the Local Plan states that North Tyneside will develop and promote approaches to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to adapt to, and mitigate the impact of, climate change, including inter alia "ensuring the highest standards in resource and energy efficiency are adopted". As currently worded our Client considers that this objective is unclear as it does not define the energy standards that developments will have to achieve. Furthermore, requiring developments to adopt the 'highest standards' may make developments unviable. Having regards to paragraphs 95 and 96 of the NPPF, it is recommended that the wording of Objective 1 is amended as follows:"promoting the renewable energy sector and developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption'	3 Vision and Objectives
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4589	0	Our Client 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 our Client does not consider the supporting text to Objective 4 to fully comply with NPPF paragraph 4 7, which requires the Council to meet " ... the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area ... ". Accordingly, our Client 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 ... "	3 Vision and Objectives
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD4884	0	Objective 1 of the Local Plan states that North Tyneside will develop and promote approaches to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to adapt to, and mitigate the impact of, climate change, including inter alia "ensuring the highest standards in resource and energy efficiency are adopted". As currently worded our Client considers that this objective is unclear as it does not define the energy standards that developments will have to achieve. Furthermore, requiring developments to adopt the 'highest standards' may make such developments unviable. Having regards to paragraphs 95 and 96 of the NPPF, it is recommended that the wording of Objective 1 is amended as follows:"promoting the renewable energy sector and developments which seek to minimise energy and resource consumption" [ensuring the highest standards in resource and energy efficiency are adopted]. Our Client 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 our Client do not consider the supporting text to Objective 4 to fully comply with	3 Vision and Objectives

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					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, our Client suggests the objective be amended as follows:" ... Along with improvements to the existing dwelling stock which will contribute to meet [most] full housing needs during the plan period..."	
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD6581	0	Our Client broadly supports Objective 2 and particularly the Council's objective of providing"attractive and accessible employment sites supported by excellent infrastructure and services providing jobs, stimulating completion, business creation and increasing skills and educational attainment". It is considered that the development of our Client's site to the south of the A1/A19 interchange at Seaton Burn for employment use has the potential to contribute towards the achievement of Objective 2.	3 Vision and Objectives
805832	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4160	0	3.4 " Objectives - Building in current arable / green areas should be based on a models of Garden Cities " with integrated green space which could be used productively for food production. Food poverty and food quality are key to well-being and there are several councils in the country " Newcastle being the closest but Brighton and Hove being the most advanced - which are leading the way in searching to helping their residents have a healthier lifestyle and enhancing quality of life.	3 Vision and Objectives
808279	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Bett Homes	LPCD5738	0	The overall objectives of the emerging plan are welcomed, particularly with regard to the aspiration to diversify, strengthen and grow the local economy (Objective 2) and provide an appropriate range and choie of housing to meet current and future needs (Objective 4). However, as set out against later considerations of the Plan within these representations, the two objectives are mutually dependent and one cannot be achieved without the other. Furthermore, it is considered that Objective 4 should be strengthened in terms of its conformity with the Framework. It should be clear that the Council will meet its "full, objecively assessed needs for market and affordable housing". If the Council does not seek to delivery its full objectively assessed needs thena clear justification, and commitment from adjoining authorities to accommodate additional housing will need to be provided as part of the plan.	3 Vision and Objectives
805832	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4158	0	3.2/3 " The vision either now or in 2013, should enshrine more leadership and positively approaching the future in terms of action " in terms of embracing the extra-ordinary nature of this place.	3 Vision and Objectives
587121	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATIONAL/ORGANISATION	Nexus	LPCD2420	0	Nexus support the Council's Objective 11. We support the Council's ambitions to generate new jobs and housing within borough, and also welcome	3 Vision and Objectives



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	NISATION				recognition of importance of travel to employment opportunities outside NT esp. Newcastle, and would reiterate the importance that this be focused on sustainable transport as a priority. Strategic transport planning is very important, not only for facilitating accessibility to existing housing/employment/leisure, but also for ensuring that opportunities for sustainable accessibility to new sites are maximised.	
396324	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Newcastle Airport	LPCD3051	0	The plan outlines future population growth and subsequent housing demand. We support the plan'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.	3 Vision and Objectives
441647	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	SITA UK Ltd	LPCD4389	0	SITA UK has a vision of a society with no more waste and, therefore, welcomes the Vision and Objective 8 within the Local Plan Consultation Draft, which aims to prioritise and promote waste reduction and also the text within paragraphs 10.47 and 10.48 that recognises the role of waste as a resource.	3 Vision and Objectives
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	CPRE	LPCD6319	0	Vision and Objectives. We see much in this proposed Local Plan to commend and relatively few points at which we would wish to disagree with the Council's proposals. In terms of the Objectives (pp. 19-21), our comments are as follows: • we welcome the emphasis on sustainability and the need to mitigate climate change (Objective #1). • We support Objective # 2, Diversity, strength and growth in the local economy providing excellent opportunities for everyone. • We support Objective #3, to enable all citizens to live their lives free from crime and to enjoy a healthy lifestyle . • We welcome the support for 25% of housing developments being affordable housing in Objective #4 but we would urge that exceptions to this policy should be granted only in the most exceptional circumstances. The viability of a development should not of itself be accepted as a valid reason for an exception. • We also welcome the stress on the regeneration of the existing town centres, the Riverside and the Coast (Objectives #5-7). • We also welcome the determination to reduce landfill waste and the commitment to reuse, recycling and composting of waste resources and products (Objective #8). • We also welcome the commitment to give priority to the development of sustainable transport, including public transport, walking and cycling (Objective #11).	3 Vision and Objectives
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6654	0	The Trust welcome the identification of the NHS as one of the partners listed at paragraph 3.2 within "Our Partners", one of the four overarching priorities and the focus of the Council Plan to assist in achieving the Council's overall vision and objectives. The Trust consider Objective 4 does not comply with the	3 Vision and Objectives

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					NPPF paragraph 47 that requires the Council to meet: "the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area". Accordingly, the Trust suggest the objective should be amended to meet the full needs of the Borough and read as follows: ". Along with improvements to the existing dwelling stock which will contribute to meet most full housing needs during the plan period".	
755686	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4586	0	Vision 2030 The proposed vision is generally considered a positive statement. It does not, however, provide any spatial emphasis nor does it set out an overall development framework for North Tyneside. The Council may wish to amend its vision to ensure it provides a clear and coherent planning strategy for the future of the area.	3 Vision and Objectives
768554	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Highways Agency	LPCD6111	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the vision, but considers that it could be strengthened. In particular, the issues of transport, such as encouraging a modal shift towards sustainable modes of transport, reduce the need to travel by private car and promoting sustainably accessible development, could be included. Particularly as these issues are reflected in the Objectives and Paragraphs 2.19 and 2.20 which highlight that North Tyneside has the highest level of car ownership in Tyne and Wear which has increased by some 8% over the last 10 years and is the second largest destination for workers commuting out of Newcastle with 83% of these inward commuters travelling by car. The Agency is generally supportive of the objectives and in particular is supportive of delivering sustainable economic growth that is sustainably accessible and supported by essential infrastructure, as promoted by Objective 2. The Agency is also supportive of Objective 4, which seeks to provide additional homes in sustainable locations. Providing homes in sustainable locations should help to reduce the need to travel by car and congestion on the SRN by locating development close to areas with a good provision of sustainable transport options. The Agency is particularly supportive of Objective 11, which seeks to improve sustainable access throughout the Borough and beyond. The principle of the objective to integrate transport and development proposals, reduce congestion and improve sustainable connectivity and accessibility, along with encouraging a modal shift to more sustainable means of transport, by making public transport, walking and cycling more viable and attractive options, is particularly welcomed. PLEASE ALSO FIND ATTACHED LETTER/SUMMARY.	3 Vision and Objectives
807164	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4873	0	NWL supports the Council's objectives, particularly with regard to Objective 1 - Ensure a sustainable future for North Tyneside with communities and	3 Vision and Objectives

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	NISATION				infrastructure that are well placed to mitigate climate change. Support is given to the content of Objective 1 which seeks to adapt to and mitigate the impact of climate change, including flood risk.	
685112	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Sport England	LPCD2717	0	The third objective of the Plan is to; “Give all residents the opportunity to live free from crime and enjoy a healthy lifestyle, achieving their potential in work and education” Sport England supports this objective, recognising as it does, the link between an active lifestyle and health and well-being. Taking part in regular sport is an intrinsic part of an active lifestyle.	3 Vision and Objectives
805135	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	North Tyneside Green Party	LPCD3382	0	Sustainable development It would have been helpful if the concept of “sustainable development” is defined in this document so that readers understand its implications and therefore may properly appreciate the proposals in the Local Plan. Central government Sustainable Development Strategy identifies the 3 dimensions of sustainable development as economic, environmental and social. Proposals for development should be assessed against these criteria taken together. It might also have been helpful to refer to the North Tyneside Council Sustainable Development Strategy.	3 Vision and Objectives
805135	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	North Tyneside Green Party	LPCD3393	0	There is reference to “sustainable communities” (3.4.12) but no definition of this. NT Green Party would argue that there are already large areas of housing in the borough which are not sustainable “ ie no easy access to local shops, post office, schools, play space, public transport “ such as in the new housing developments around West Allotment and Northumberland Park (the Metro and Sainsbury’s etc are quite a long way from some areas of new housing). Other housing in the pipeline such as that at West Moor is also unsustainable in relation to these criteria. Wherever possible, existing towns and urban areas should be made “sustainable” by identifying and encouraging the development of facilities such as public transport routes, local shops, post offices, play areas etc	3 Vision and Objectives
805135	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	North Tyneside Green Party	LPCD3397	0	While the North Tyneside Green Party welcomes many aspects of the draft Local Plan we are concerned that the sum total of proposals will not lead to enhancement or a sustainable future for the borough’s people and wildlife. We urge the Council to review this draft within the context of a more inclusive view of the relationship between people and their environment. We are fortunate in North Tyneside to have large areas of open space. This open space should not be seen as just areas for potential housing or economic development but as providing opportunities for encouraging interaction between people and environment in life enhancing and sustainable ways.	3 Vision and Objectives

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3127	0	Page 20, aim 10 Protect and enhance the built environment – this section lists all the designated heritage assets plus the local list. This section should therefore also mention undesignated heritage assets including archaeological remains. Such remains are a material consideration in the planning process. The section should include the terms designated and undesignated heritage assets as per the NPPF and explain their meanings in a glossary.	3 Vision and Objectives
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6689	0	The presumption in favour of sustainable development policy (draft Policy DM/2.1) is in general conformity with the Framework and is supported.	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
473231	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Mr M Burke	LPCD5016	0	The Burke family objects to the Spatial Strategy. The classification of Urban Fringe, Main Urban Area and Four Priority Investment Areas has no evidence base. The latter are highly aspirational and do not reflect market demand in respect of North Shields Wallsend and Willington Quay. The Coast and the North West Communities are worthy of priority but this is negated when the Plan refuses to copy neighbouring Newcastle and Northumberland in deleting some suitable land from the Green Belt such as Burradon/Camperdown. The Green Belt was set in the 1980s and is overdue for review in the light of this 15 year plan period. Where urban fringe as its designated is in the NW Communities special circumstances exist for its re-appraisal to achieve the investment planned. The designation of the NW Area is welcomed. The Burradon/Camperdown site is well integrated into the Killingworth township close to the retail area and served by public transport. It is PDL in the Green Belt having been a former colliery which has been reclaimed. Therefore, policy S1.1 b) ii is supported with the amendment it may include Green Belt deletions. The Weetslade site (over) whilst singled out as Site 109 has not taken the opportunity to comply with NPPF Para 22 which states that; - "Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose". A plan of the Weetslade site is displayed below. It does not share the high site clearance/land acquisition costs of some Potential Sites identified eg. North Tyne Ind Est. The Burke family wish to object to para 4.10 where the strategy asserts it can accommodate new development which has been demonstrated in	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>the review of the Potential Sites Background Paper it cannot. The maintenance of the existing Green Belt cannot be sustained and will not meet the claimed strategic objectives relating to open space, recreation and biodiversity in respect of the Burradon/Camperdown site as it is private land without public access. Para 89 of NPPF is relevant where at the last bullet point it states that exceptions to no development in the Green Belt include:- "limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development". To ensure requirements for homes can be met the spatial strategy proposed states that most housing development will be located partly within areas of "the North West where development could bring particular benefits to the regeneration of the area. The Burradon/Camperdown site lies within the NW Area and is a former colliery where licensed tipping has taken place but remediation means that the land is capable of supporting 80kN/sqm for normal house foundations and there is no land fill gas issue. These costs are far lower than redeveloping many of the Potential Sites eg Willington Quay. Access could be provided as part of the development for the public to enjoy Burradon Pond. The Council would obtain a capital receipt from the development if this land to enable it to carry out other parts of the strategy. A plan of the Burradon/Camperdown site is attached. The square of land forming the access between the track and the Burke site is owned by North Tyneside Council who have granted an option over it (Paul Green) to provide an access to the Burke land for residential development. They intend to seek C3 permission on their own land in due course. A lottery bid has been made to manage the pond in the SW corner of the site by the Northumbria Wildlife Trust (Joanne Norman). A site investigation has been carried out (REC Ltd) which concludes the site was tipped with inert waste only. A TA has been done (Allan Short) which working with North Tyneside Engineers and the Highways Agency (to inc A19/Tyne Tunnel), demonstrates the site can accept up to 500 dwellings. A layout has been done (Intersect Architects) indicating 480 dwellings inc 25% affordable housing to meet Policy DM/7.5. Conclusion The Local Plan Consultation Draft should:- Review the Green Belt in the Priority Areas (NW) with a view to deleting the site at Burradon/Camperdown and allocating as Safeguarded Land with some allocation within the Plan Period for housing. It</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					should reconsider its Proposed Sites in the Background Paper in particular Site 109 which is capable of providing housing in lieu of the less realistic sites identified. Killingworth Break not being in the Green Belt should be considered for some limited housing which doesn't close the gap or affect the Conservation Area.	
587121	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Nexus	LPCD2431	0	Map 2 in section 4 may give the impression that there is a Metro connection to the East Coast Main Line at Benton, this should be clarified by perhaps showing the heavy rail connection in a different colour, and extending it northwards towards Blyth; this would make it consistent with Map 1 (which also shows a confusing Metro link to the ECML).	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6649	0	These representations outline the Trust's current intentions for their portfolio of land and existing operations in the context of paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states: "Local Planning Authorities should work with public health leads and health organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the population including expected future changes, and any information about relevant barriers to improving health and well-being."	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
805135	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	North Tyneside Green Party	LPCD3386	0	Re sustainable communities: There is reference to "sustainable communities" (4.2) but no definition of this. NT Green Party would argue that there are already large areas of housing in the borough which are not sustainable "ie no easy access to local shops, post office, schools, play space, public transport" such as in the new housing developments around West Allotment and Northumberland Park (the Metro and Sainsbury's etc are quite a long way from some areas of new housing). Other housing in the pipeline such as that at West Moor is also unsustainable in relation to these criteria. Wherever possible, existing towns and urban areas should be made "sustainable" by identifying and encouraging the development of facilities such as public transport routes, local shops, post offices, play areas etc	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
805135	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	North Tyneside Green Party	LPCD3389	0	Para 4.7 refers to the principle of sustainable development guiding and influencing the "location and scale of development to ensure it is accessible by public transport, cycling and walking and that it reduces the need to travel". Transport although very important is not the only criteria for a sustainable community "there is also a need for schools, play areas for children, local shops and facilities which can support the less mobile and older members of the community.	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
805069	OTHER /	Tyne and Wear	LPCD3135	0	All the maps should say Scheduled Ancient Monument not Ancient Monument. I	4 Sustainable

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	LOCAL ORGANISATION	Archaeology Officer			personally don't like the symbol which has been used (the brick pattern). A block colour would look clearer. Conservation Areas are too similar a colour to the roads on the map.	Development Strategy for North Tyneside
807438	PLANNING CONSULTANCY	Rapleys	LPCD5116	0	Support Sections 4.24-4.29 which defines the North Shields Sub Area. We acknowledge and support the intention to promote investment and regeneration within the sub-area.	4 Sustainable Development Strategy for North Tyneside
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4652		<p>Treatment of Smiths Dock Under the Consultation Draft Local Plan, Smiths Dock falls within the North Shields Priority Investment and Regeneration Area. Policy AS/1.3 of the Consultation Draft identifies investment and regeneration priorities for North Shields. However, Policy AS/1.3 does not make any specific reference to Smiths Dock. Pp and Fairhurst would expect that such a significant development site should be referenced in the policy to ensure that an appropriate development framework is established to deliver regeneration. Paragraph 4.29 of the Consultation Draft Local Plan states that: There are a variety of potential sites for development in North Shields that might be suitable for housing development, which will be covered in the Potential Development Sites section of this consultation draft. Smith's Dock, a prominent housing site, is not included within this Plan as it has benefited from planning permission for a number of years with significant investment already in place reclaiming the site for development and putting in key infrastructure such as the link road.</p> <p>In line with the above text, the potential Development Sites plan which forms part of the Consultation Draft Local Plan shows Smith's Dock as a large site with planning permission. Pp and Fairhurst fully agree that the site already benefits from planning permission and that significant investment is already in place. However, as the largest housing site in NTC's 5 year housing land supply, Pp and Fairhurst do not consider it to be comprehensive forward planning for Smith's Dock to be not included within this Plan. Pp and Fairhurst recognise that NTC have taken the current approach because a significant level of planning and delivery has already been undertaken in relation to the site. However, as previously discussed, as appropriate framework must be established to deliver the development of the site to provide much needed housing and regeneration. Additionally, NTC must clearly consider and</p>	AS/1.3 The North Shields Sub Area

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					ultimately demonstrate the relationship between existing undeveloped site and the objectively assessed housing requirements for the emerging Local Plan. At present, NTC have identified a housing requirements and process to identify specific housing sites. However, there is significant ambiguity regarding the soundness of the housing figures (as discussed below) and, at the current stage, realistically, a "call for sites" has been undertaken based on a wider range of "potential development sites". It is very difficult to comment on the strategy or housing numbers proposed in the emerging Local Plan based on the current stage of preparation.	
768554	GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION	Highways Agency	LPCD6120		The Agency is generally supportive of the policy and the intentions to deliver investment and regeneration in North Shields. In particular, the Agency is supportive of seeking to improve sustainable connectivity within the sub area. Whilst the Agency is supportive of the principle of increasing economic activity at the Port of Tyne, consideration of the implications of such development on the SRN alongside the Plan's other development proposals will be necessary, as and when the preferred site allocations are identified.	AS/1.3 The North Shields Sub Area
805832	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4165	In part	The Ferry landing should be moved to the West Quay to link more directly with the Town Centre and the active part of the Quay,	AS/1.3 The North Shields Sub Area
806149	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS		LPCD4309	Yes	Within North Shields, NRR support the Councils commitment to Attract new investment by enhancing the town centres image as an inviting place to live, work, shop and enjoy as set out in Policy AS/1.3 (The North Shields Sub Area). 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
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION		LPCD6518	Yes	We welcome the commitment to the maintenance of the historic environment, biodiversity and Geodiversity assets of North Shields.	AS/1.3 The North Shields Sub Area
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3130		4.26 North Shields is in original a medieval town. Can there be some mention of archaeological remains in here?	AS/1.3 The North Shields Sub Area
591349	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4137	Yes	NWT is 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
396412	OTHER / LOCAL	Northumbe	LPCD6047	Yes	Paragraph 81 of NPPF states that LPAs should plan positively to enhance the	AS/1.3 The



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	ORGANISATION	rland Wildlife Trust			beneficial uses of Green Belt, such as biodiversity. This is not reflected in this policy of in the text of the document in this chapter.	North Shields Sub Area
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	0	LPCD6519	Yes	We welcome the protection of green spaces in the Fish Quay area.	AS/1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay
591349	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4139	In part	Northumberland Wildlife Trust 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 ie: kittiwakes breeding at the Tyne Ferry Landings, artic 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.	AS/1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay
768554	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Highways Agency	LPCD6121	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the policy and seeking to deliver a vibrant mixed use area with improved sustainable connectivity. Such provisions, along with the focus on a mixed use area should help to deliver sustainable homes close that benefit from being located with good access to existing and new services, facilities and employment opportunities, thereby helping to reduce the need to travel.	AS/1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3131	0	AS/1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay this sub area includes the medieval village and the subsequent medieval new town and 19th century New Quay. Can archaeological remains be mentioned in this section?	AS/1.4 Fish Quay and New Quay
805724	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Horton Estate	LPCD4058	Yes	Support expressed for the policy and in particular for criterion c which seeks to integrate growth and development at the Coast with the protection and enhancement of the built environment including at Whitley Bay and St Mary's Island.	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	0	LPCD6520	Yes	In the Coastal Area (AS/1 :5) we support the commitment to the regeneration of the Whitley Bay town centre, the commitment to protect heritage assets and the recognition of the need for sustainable transport links.	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
768554	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Highways Agency	LPCD6122	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the intentions and strategy for the sub area and particularly welcomes the intentions to improve and develop sustainable transport links, such as public transport, walking and cycling provisions.	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3132	0	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area – this area includes St. Mary’s Island which is of archaeological interest, Whitley medieval village (the precursor to Whitley Bay the Victorian seaside resort) and Tynemouth castle, priory, medieval village and cemetery. Can this section therefore mention archaeological remains?	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumbria Wildlife Trust	LPCD6133	In part	<p>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 SSSI status along the entire coast and also the following;</p> <p>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 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 restated its vision for – clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas. To help deliver this vision the Government with Devolved Administrations has committed to creating an ecologically coherent network of marine protected areas; 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. 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</p>	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>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 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.</p>	
591349	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD4140	In part	<p>Northumberland Wildlife Trust 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 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 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</p>	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>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 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 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, ie: 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</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					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.	
510094	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Natural England	LPCD6750	0	<p>Map 5 should also identify the SPA and SSSI (see advice on Map1 above).</p> <p>Part b promotes proposals which extend the range and provision of tourist and visitor attractions, including water based recreation, within the coastal zone. Part f encourages development which improves accessibility within the coastal area. Whilst part c seeks to integrate growth with the natural environment, it must be clearly recognised that some proposals may not be permitted due to their direct or indirect effects on the SPA/Ramsar (determined through HRA) and SSSI (determined through EIA).</p> <p>Natural England is particularly concerned that, in addition to effects upon the SPA and Ramsar, increased visitors to the coast could adversely affect SSSI interest features<sup>1</sup>. The Northumberland Shore SSSIs covers the entire North Tyneside coastline, including the bays between headlands and rock platforms (which are part of the SPA/Ramsar). Recreational disturbance of wading birds has been identified by Natural England as a threat to the SSSIs condition, therefore further tourist and visitor facilities and water based recreation during the winter may significantly affect these interest features and threaten the SSSI's favourable condition.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 118 states that “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. Where an adverse effect on the site’s notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest.”</p> <p>Given the extent of the Northumberland Shore SSSI, its interest features and its sensitivity to recreational disturbance, the next iteration of the plan should ensure that policy A/S1.5 reflects national policy above, otherwise it may</p>	AS/1.5 The Coastal Sub Area

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>promote development within the coastal zone which is contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>Natural England suggest the following wording for part c:</p> <p>“Integrate growth and development with the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, ensuring it has no adverse effects upon the interest features of the nationally and internationally protected nature conservation sites.”</p> <p>Protection of heritage interests should be dealt with separately from biodiversity interests.</p> <p>Map 5 should also identify the SPA and SSSI (see advice on Map1 above).</p> <p>Part b promotes proposals which extend the range and provision of tourist and visitor attractions, including water based recreation, within the coastal zone. Part f encourages development which improves accessibility within the coastal area. Whilst part c seeks to integrate growth with the natural environment, it must be clearly recognised that some proposals may not be permitted due to their direct or indirect effects on the SPA/Ramsar (determined through HRA) and SSSI (determined through EIA).</p> <p>Natural England is particularly concerned that, in addition to effects upon the SPA and Ramsar, increased visitors to the coast could adversely affect SSSI interest features<sup>1</sup>. The Northumberland Shore SSSIs covers the entire North Tyneside coastline, including the bays between headlands and rock platforms (which are part of the SPA/Ramsar). Recreational disturbance of wading birds has been identified by Natural England as a threat to the SSSIs condition, therefore further tourist and visitor facilities and water based recreation during the winter may significantly affect these interest features and threaten the SSSI’s favourable condition.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 118 states that “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. Where an adverse effect on the site’s notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>made where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest.”</p> <p>Given the extent of the Northumberland Shore SSSI, its interest features and its sensitivity to recreational disturbance, the next iteration of the plan should ensure that policy A/S1.5 reflects national policy above, otherwise it may promote development within the coastal zone which is contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>Natural England suggest the following wording for part c:</p> <p>“Integrate growth and development with the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, ensuring it has no adverse effects upon the interest features of the nationally and internationally protected nature conservation sites.”</p> <p>Protection of heritage interests should be dealt with separately from biodiversity interests. Map 5 should also identify the SPA and SSSI (see advice on Map1 above).</p> <p>Part b promotes proposals which extend the range and provision of tourist and visitor attractions, including water based recreation, within the coastal zone. Part f encourages development which improves accessibility within the coastal area. Whilst part c seeks to integrate growth with the natural environment, it must be clearly recognised that some proposals may not be permitted due to their direct or indirect effects on the SPA/Ramsar (determined through HRA) and SSSI (determined through EIA).</p> <p>Natural England is particularly concerned that, in addition to effects upon the SPA and Ramsar, increased visitors to the coast could adversely affect SSSI interest features<sup>1</sup>. The Northumberland Shore SSSIs covers the entire North Tyneside coastline, including the bays between headlands and rock platforms (which are part of the SPA/Ramsar). Recreational disturbance of wading birds has been identified by Natural England as a threat to the SSSIs condition, therefore further tourist and visitor facilities and water based recreation during</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>the winter may significantly affect these interest features and threaten the SSSI's favourable condition.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 118 states that “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. Where an adverse effect on the site’s notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest.”</p> <p>Given the extent of the Northumberland Shore SSSI, its interest features and its sensitivity to recreational disturbance, the next iteration of the plan should ensure that policy A/S1.5 reflects national policy above, otherwise it may promote development within the coastal zone which is contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>Natural England suggest the following wording for part c:</p> <p>“Integrate growth and development with the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, ensuring it has no adverse effects upon the interest features of the nationally and internationally protected nature conservation sites.”</p> <p>Protection of heritage interests should be dealt with separately from biodiversity interests.</p>	
473231	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	0	LPCD5030	0	<p>Para 4.39- 4.49 deals with the NW Communities Sub-area Strategy. Camperdown and Burradon are included in the collection of communities made up by this sub area. Policy AS/1.6 c states that:- North Tyneside Council will work with owners of vacant sites to bring them back into suitable, beneficial use . This will reduce unattractive dereliction, encourage investment and improve quality of life for the community. Burradon Pond could be added to para 4.44 should it form part of a residential development. Para 4.46 refers to a long term council aspiration for development at Weetslade but if this is for employment only it</p>	AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					will never occur, especially without the Sandy Lane bypass which cannot be funded. Weetslade could be developed for housing as part of an overall mixed-use scheme. The Annitsford Farm site should be replaced with the Burradon/Camperdown site in the NW Area which brings wider benefits.	
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD4896	0	Policy AS/1.6: The North West Communities Sub Area This Policy relates to a number of settlements including Seaton Burn. Our Client is broadly supportive of the principles outlined in Policy AS/1.6, however, it is considered that the policy needs to be expanded to specifically address housing need in the North West Communities Area. It is not clear from the Local Plan evidence base as to the need and demand for housing in this area of North Tyneside. At present the distribution of housing, referred to in Policy S/7.3, appears to relate the availability of suitable sites rather than the future demand for housing in the sub areas defined. However, as acknowledged in the supporting text to Policy AS/1.6, the settlements within the North West Communities Sub Area lack coherent identity and as a whole the area presents a poor image, which affects the quality of life for residents. New, well designed housing on appropriate sites will help to address these issues and should therefore be specifically mentioned in the Policy. It is therefore recommended that the following bullet point is added to the Policy:"Increase the overall quality and supply of housing"	AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD6583	In part	This Policy relates to a number of settlements including Seaton Burn. Our Client is broadly supportive of the principles outlined in Policy AS/1.6, however, it is considered that the policy needs to be expanded to specifically address the potential for employment uses in the area. Paragraph 4.43 of the supporting text highlights the fact 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 North West Area. Furthermore, the area serves as a gateway into North Tyneside from the two adjacent areas of Newcastle City and Northumberland County. In this context, it is clear that the North West Communities Area is an ideal location for employment uses, which can benefit from the excellent transport links and proximity to potential employees within North Tyneside, Newcastle and Northumberland. Indeed our Client's site, located adjacent to the A1/A19 interchange, offers a regionally unique opportunity for the development of an employment location which is well located to this major road interchange and potential employees. Despite this, at present the Policy does not acknowledge the potential for any employment uses in the Sub Area. It is therefore recommended that the Policy is expanded by	AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					adding the following wording: 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.	
808367	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	0	LPCD5698	In part	The following paragraphs set out our client's (Mr G Oliver) response to this policy. The provisions of AS/1.6 for the North West area are generally supported, particularly the inclusion of site 4 within the North West area is also supported.	AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	0	LPCD6522	Yes	Under Policy AS/1 :6, we welcome the commitment to secure the beneficial use of vacant sites to "sustainable, efficient use". We also welcome the fact that the Council appears not to be proposing any Green Belt deletions. More generally, we welcome the adoption by the Council of a strong "brownfield first" policy, together with its determination to preserve open spaces and the Green Belt (Policy #S3/l ), together with the requirement that any approved development within the Green Belt must preserve the openness of the Green Belt (Policy AS/5:6). However, we would urge that developers who are in possession of sites with preciously granted planning permissions should be compelled to develop them within a reasonable time and before they apply for permission to develop greenfield sites or sites in the Green Belt.	AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area
768554	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Highways Agency	LPCD6124	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the policy and in particular welcomes the provisions of Part a. which seeks to deliver improvements to public transport and active travel options. This is considered particularly pertinent to the sub area given its semi-rural location and dispersed nature of settlements which means they suffer from a degree of isolation both geographically and in terms of service provision, as reflected in Paragraphs 4.45 and 4.49. Given the proximity of the A1 and A19 within the North West Communities sub area, there is the potential for future development in this location to impact on the operation or safety of the network. As stated in response to Policy S/1.1, it is important to ensure that the development aspirations for the North West Communities sub area are robustly assessed and demonstrates that existing infrastructure is capable of accommodating it or its impacts can be mitigated. Where improvements may be required, these should be assessed and identified in accordance with Circular 02/2013.	AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3133	0	AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area includes Burradon Tower scheduled ancient monument and Burradon medieval village and the 19th century mining settlements of Burradon, Seaton Burn, Dudley, Annitsford and Wideopen. Archaeological remains need to be taken into account in this area.	AS/1.6 The North West Communities Sub Area

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
805135	COUNCILLOR	North Tyneside Green Party	LPCD3383	0	Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development: The NT Green Party believe that if there are areas in the borough where there are no up to date policies or no policies to cover them, then the council should make such decisions before the draft of this Local Plan is finalised. No planning application should be permitted because the Council has no policy on the matter; relevant policies must be created or updated.	DM/2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4649	Yes	General Development Principles PfP and Fairhurst welcome the flexibility in the policy approach and wording of Policies DM/2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. It is considered that the approach to promoting sustainable development is aligned with the NPPF and will be responsive to changes in context throughout the plan period.	DM/2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6125	0	The Agency is supportive of the general principle of taking a positive approach towards the presumption in favour of sustainable development as promoted by the National Planning Policy Framework.	DM/2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
808279	LAND DEVELOPER	0	LPCD5745	Yes	The presumption in favour of sustainable development (Draft Policy DM/2.1) is in general conformity with the Framework and is supported.	DM/2.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
810041	BUSINESS	0	LPCD6691	No	Draft Policy DM/2.2 sets out the broad criteria by which development proposals will be found acceptable. The caveat that proposals will be found acceptable when compliance with the criteria is achieved, subject to economic viability, is welcomed. Economic viability represents a key constraint on the overall deliverability of the plan objectives as discussed against draft Policy S/1.1 (above). With regard to the criteria of draft Policy DM/2.2, the proposal to 'prioritise the use of brownfield sites over greenfield sites' is objected to on the basis that this is not consistent with the Framework and risks the ability of the Council to achieve the objectives of the plan. This position is set out at paragraph 111 of the Framework and has been upheld in a number of recent appeal decisions (including Secretary of State decisions), with an example being	DM/2.2 General Development Principles

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Burgess Farm, Worsley (PINS Ref: 2157433) which concludes at paragraph 14 that: "The Secretary of State agreed that the sequential approach to the location of housing development is not reflected in the Framework".	
805135	COUNCILLOR	North Tyneside Green Party	LPCD3384	No	See above re the need for a definition of Sustainable Development. The criteria used here do not refer to the 3 dimensions of economic, environmental and social taken together. NT Green Party welcome the commitment to the use of brownfield sites wherever possible and/or appropriate given that some of such sites may be rich in wildlife.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4650	Yes	General Development Principles PfP and Fairhurst welcome the flexibility in the policy approach and wording of Policies DM/2.2 General Development Principles. PfP support the prioritisation of brownfield land under Policy DM/2.2 General Development Principles as it is considered that sites such as Smiths Dock provide a significant opportunity to meet housing requirements and deliver urban regeneration.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6613	In part	The majority of the principles proposed appear to be reasonable and in accordance with national policy, however there is concern that part is in conflict with the NPPF. Paragraph 111 of the Framework states that Authorities should encourage the effective (PHNE emphasis) use of previously developed land (PDL) and this should be reflected by Local Policy. Whilst the rationale behind the policy is in line with the above, giving priority to the development of PDL is not considered to be consistent with National Policy. This provides for a sequential approach and is not considered to represent a policy which will meet the NPPFs aim of significantly boosting housing supply.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6141	0	The Agency is supportive of the policy and the general development principles proposed. In particular, the Agency welcomes the policy intentions detailed in Part f. which seek to deliver development in locations where it can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and facilities and where it encourages the use of more sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling. Part f. also requires new development to make provision for new or improved infrastructure should it be required, which again is particularly supported. As stated in response to Policy S/1.1, any additional infrastructure should be planned for as part of the Plan preparation process rather than being left to the planning application stage. Therefore the Agency will expect that the Plan and supporting IDP, includes all transport infrastructure measures necessary to sustainably deliver the plans development aspirations and that these measures have been proposed based on robust evidence, which in	DM/2.2 General Development Principles

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					relation to the SRN, has been agreed with the Agency.	
807164	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4878	Yes	NWL supports the statement within policy DM/2.2 that the development proposals must minimise the impact and mitigate the likely effects of climate change.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes (Newcastle )	LPCD6010	0	Under policy DM/2.2 the Council prioritise the use of brownfield land. This is not consistent with para 111 of the NPPF which seeks to encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed rather than prioritise it. The Council should reword this policy to demonstrate a requirement to encourage the use of brownfield land rather than to prioritise it. This would bring the Policy in line with the requirements of national planning policy.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD6584	In part	Policy DM/2.2: d) seeks to prioritise the use of brownfield sites over greenfield and make the best and most efficient use of available land. As currently worded, this element of Policy DM/2.2 is not in complete accordance with the NPPF (paras 17 and 111) which seeks to "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed". It is considered that in order to ensure consistency with national policy, Policy DM/2.2 d) should be replaced with the following text:"d) Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed, provided that it is not of high environmental value".	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD4904	0	Policy DM/2.2: General Development Principles Policy DM/2.2: d) seeks to prioritise the use of brownfield sites over greenfield and make the best and most efficient use of available land. As currently worded, this element of Policy DM/2.2 is not in complete accordance with the NPPF (paras 17 and 111) which seeks to "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed". It is considered that in order to ensure consistency with national policy, Policy DM/2.2 d) should be replaced with the following text:"d) Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed, provided that it is not of high environmental value".	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
808367	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	0	LPCD5699	In part	Our client (Mr G Oliver) generally supports this policy, however the wording of criterion d) should be amended. The NPPF (17) does not require the 'prioritisation' of brownfield sites over greenfield. Greenfield land may in many circumstances provide more suitable sites than previously developed land and thus should not be precluded on the basis that it has not been previously developed. The policy criterion should be amended to: d). Encourage effective use of previously developed land where suitable and available and make the	DM/2.2 General Development Principles

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					best and most efficient use of available land.	
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3136	0	DM/2.2 General Development Principles (e) should this section also specifically mention heritage assets?	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3160	0	All Greenfield sites have the potential for archaeological sites to survive and so archaeological work will be required.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6041	0	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 of this policy states that wherever possible [to] address identified impacts of a proposal upon designations that seek to protect and/or enhance the Boroughs natural environment. To include the words wherever possible would therefore be contrary to NPPF.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
807008	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland and Newcastle Society	LPCD4714	0	There appears to be inconsistency in the way the council prioritise the use of brown field sites. There is no mention in your plans to the revitalisation of older housing stock or the encouragement you need to give to private landlords to bring empty properties into use many lie currently un-used above commercial buildings.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
591349	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4112	No	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 of this policy states that wherever possible [to] address identified impacts of a proposal upon designations that seek to protect and/or enhance the Boroughs natural environment. To include the words wherever possible would therefore be contrary to NPPF.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
755686	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4592	No	Part of the policy seeks to prioritise the use of brownfield land, this is not consistent with paragraph 111 of the NPPF which seeks to encourage (our emphasis) the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developedâ€™. It is recommended that the policy be amended to ensure compliance with the NPPF.	DM/2.2 General Development Principles
807438	PLANNING	Rapleys	LPCD5119	Yes	Support Policy DM/2.2 General Development Principles particularly in relation to	DM/2.2

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	CONSULTANCY				the presumption in favour of promoting the redevelopment of brownfield sites. We consider this is in keeping with the aims and aspirations of NPPF and consider that brownfield sites, such as Albion House (site 64), offer substantial potential to meet the requirements outlined by the consultation draft. The continuation of the current use of this site is limited and therefore a suitable and viable alternative use allocation is required in order to ensure that redevelopment on the site can be effectively delivered. We provide further details within this letter confirming our clients view on the alternative uses proposed.	General Development Principles
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6692	0	At this stage it is considered too early for the Council to conclude there is no requirement to review green belt boundaries over the forthcoming plan period. This is particularly the case having regard to the concerns over the ability of the authority to accommodate its 'full, objectively assessed needs' for housing over the plan period, or provide robust evidence that adjoining authorities can, and are willing to, accommodate any additional housing. A number of housing allocations were identified within the 2002 UDP which all now either benefit from planning permission and/or are currently under construction. In the meantime, a number of sites identified as safeguarded land within the UDP have since secured planning permission and it is considered highly likely that pressure to release other areas of safeguarded land will continue over the forthcoming plan period, particularly having regard to the requirement to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for housing over the plan period (NPPF, paragraph 47) and the reliance on sites within the 'main urban area'. With effective masterplanning of the BPL site it will be possible to ensure any development does not affect the identity of Killingworth. It should also be noted that the BPL land does not include any element of the 'Killingworth Break' identified within the adopted UDP. In the context of paragraph 85 of the Framework the emerging Local Plan should now be considering those areas of 'safeguarded land' within the existing UDP for their ability to accommodate development over the emerging plan period. Safeguarded Land was designated in the 2002 UDP to ensure sufficient land was available to accommodate development needs following the end of the plan period, thereby avoiding the need for a comprehensive review of the Green Belt boundary. It is considered without th is review of safeguarded land, there is a significant risk of the Council not being	3 Green Belt, Safeguarded Land and Killingworth Break

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>able to achieve the objectives of the emerging plan, or the plan being found unsound during examination. Whilst it is too early to conclude the Green Belt itself does not need to be reviewed, release of appropriate areas of Safeguarded Land will minimise the need to review the designated Green Belt. It is considered that the BPL land should form a key area of safeguarded land release. The site can deliver a wide variety of planning benefits and has the critical mass to result in a highly sustainable development, which could deliver a number of services and facilities to the benefit of the development and surrounding areas. With regard to paragraphs 4.54 and 4.62 of the draft plan, there appears to be a conflict relating to whether or not the Council will review those existing areas of safeguarded land. Paragraph 4.54 appears to suggest existing areas of safeguarded land will be carried forward into the new plan, whilst paragraph 4.62 appears to suggest there may be an element of review. This should be clarified.</p>	
755686	BUSINESS	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4593	0	<p>Paragraph 4.54 Green Belt The Green Belt section of the plan identifies that there is no requirement to review the Green Belt boundary. This statement appears to be reliant upon other authorities accepting some of North Tyneside's objectively assessed housing needs. As discussed in other comments upon the duty to co-operate and proposed housing requirement there is no evidence, at this stage, that other authorities would either be willing or capable of accepting the unmet needs of North Tyneside. The NPPF provides the Council with the opportunity to consider a review of its Green Belt as part of the local plan preparation process, providing exception circumstances exist (NPPF paragraph 83). The need to accommodate the objectively assessed housing need of the area could be considered such exceptional circumstances and indeed has been used by numerous other local authorities as a reason for reviewing Green Belt boundaries. It is therefore advised that the Council undertake work upon a strategic Green Belt review to ensure that they can accommodate the objectively assessed housing need of the area. In undertaking such a review the need to set a Green Belt boundary which endures well beyond the current plan period (NPPF paragraphs 83, 85) should be considered.</p>	3 Green Belt, Safeguarded Land and Killingworth Break
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6620	In part	<p>The purposes of the green belt in North Tyneside reflected in this policy appear to be logical and accord with the tests as set out in the NPPF. However it is worth stating that in light of the concern over the proposed level of housing growth, the formulation of the NTLF provides a major opportunity for a review</p>	S/3.1 The Green Belt



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					of the green belt in the borough. This will ensure that the green belt boundaries can endure well beyond the plan period, as required by paragraphs 83 and 85 of the NPPF. Should the housing number in the plan increase to ensure that the full, objectively assessed housing needs of the borough can be provided for then there will potentially be a requirement to release land from the green belt. Such releases should be made based on a comprehensive review of the North Tyneside green belt.	
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6145	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the policy and the restrictions it places on further encroachment into the countryside. Through its implementation it should ensure only the most sustainably accessible locations are selected for development, prioritising locations close to existing services, facilities and sustainable means of transport and thereby helping to reduce the need to travel, particularly by private car.	S/3.1 The Green Belt
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes (Newcastle )	LPCD6011	0	The Council sets out in the consultation draft that there is no requirement to review the Green Belt boundary. However, this can only be justified based on the Councils assumption/belief that neighbouring authorities (Northumberland and Newcastle). There must be solid evidence of this, before the Council can justify that no Green Belt boundary review is needed. As part of the Local Plan preparation process, para 83 of the NPPF provides the Council with the opportunity to consider a review of the Green Belt, providing exceptional circumstances exist. The need to accommodate the objectively assessed housing need of North Tyneside could be considered exceptional circumstances. BDW are of the opinion that the Council should undertake a review of the Green Belt boundary to ensure it can accommodate housing, recognising the need to set a boundary which endures well beyond the current plan period (NPPF, para 83, 85). The Council is currently basing the Green Belt boundary on the UDP (2006), which is out-dated. The policy as it stands is very conclusive, with no flexibility. It should be revised and based on a review of the Green Belt, alongside the objectively assessed housing need in the borough.	S/3.1 The Green Belt
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD4906	0	Policy S/3.1: The Green Belt 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	S/3.1 The Green Belt

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. At this stage in the Local Plan preparation there is therefore an opportunity to review the existing Green Belt boundaries. Paragraph 4.54 of the supporting text to Policy S/3.1 explains that due to the use of previously safeguarded land for new potential allocations in the emerging Local Plan there is no requirement to review Green Belt boundaries in North Tyneside. However, our Client believes that the Council should use this opportunity to scrutinise the existing Green Belt boundaries and make appropriate minor amendments 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 to the west of Russell Square currently lies within the Green Belt. However, it is considered that the inclusion of this site within the Green Belt is not necessary to keep the Green Belt permanently open, given that the site is surrounded on three sides by urban development and a more appropriate and defensible boundary would be the southern boundary of our Client's site. The exclusion of our Client's site from the Green Belt would not affect the purposes of the Green Belt as defined in Policy S/3.1 of the draft 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 3 sides by urban features. In the context of the above and given that our Client's site is identified in the SHLAA as a suitable and available site for housing development, our Client therefore recommends a minor amendment to the Green Belt boundary around Seaton Burn to remove the land to the west of Russell Square as defined on the plan at Appendix 1.</p>	
473231	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	landowner	LPCD5031	No	<p>Para 4.53-4.65 deals with Green Belt and Safeguarded land. There should be a review of some of the safeguarded land which hasn't come forward rather than accepting its contribution to the strategy eg Murton bad ground. Policy S/3.1 recites the 5 purposes of the Green Belt from the former PPS2 and NPPF. It fails to take the opportunity Newcastle and Northumberland have of a review. In particular the Burke family objects to para 4.60 which states that:- "The draft Local Plan has consequently not sought to review or amend the existing boundaries of the Green Belt in North Tyneside". There is no rigorous review of the safeguarded land's capacity to meet the development needs. Para 4.52 is not consistent with NPPF in that it still employs a sequential test of re-use of</p>	S/3.1 The Green Belt

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					brown field land. NPPF applies the sequential test to retail and flooding and not to residential land allocations. Para 111 does encourage reuse of brownfield land where its not of high environmental value such as Burradon/Camperdown and Weetslade. The Burke family objects to Policy S.3.3 which seeks to allocate new safeguarded land only after the end of the plan period. The strategy should be to review the Green Belt and Safeguarded Land which hasn't come forward for technical or land ownership reasons and to be more realistic about the Potential Sites Background Paper.	
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD6585	In part	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. At this stage in the Local Plan preparation there is therefore an opportunity to review the existing Green Belt boundaries. Paragraph 4.54 of the supporting text to Policy S/3.1 explains 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 believes that the Council should use this opportunity to scrutinise the existing Green Belt boundaries and make appropriate amendments 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 to the south of the A1/ A19 Interchange 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 either 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 to the south remaining within the Green Belt. The exclusion of our Client's site from the Green Belt would not affect the purposes of the Green Belt as defined in Policy S/3.1 of the draft Local Plan. It is	S/3.1 The Green Belt

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>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 3 sides by the A1, A19 and Front Street. Our Client therefore recommends that the Green Belt boundary around Seaton Burn is amended to remove the land to the south of the A1/ A19 Interchange as defined on the plan at Appendix 1.</p>	
804025	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	landowner (fairhurst)	LPCD2621	No	<p>Fairhurst have reviewed the Local Plan Consultation Draft "Potential Development Sites" plan. The Local Plan Consultation Draft proposes to retain the Eastfield House site within the Green Belt. The site has not been identified as a potential development site and therefore has not been considered for development. This means that NTC have not undertaken a sustainability appraisal in relation to the development of the site to assess whether the site would secure a more sustainable score if it was redeveloped for housing instead of being retained in its current use. Fairhurst note that, as part of the North Tyneside Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (October 2003), the site has been identified as "Wellfield B, Site Ref: 303 but the SHLAA states that the site has zero potential for housing because it falls within the Green Belt. Based on the fact that NTC may not be able to accommodate all objectively assessed housing requirements on the "potential development sites", Fairhurst consider that Green Belt sites such as the Eastfield House site should be reviewed and considered for development. Mr Watson, as the landowner, wishes to develop the site for new housing. Fairhurst, on behalf of Mr Watson, request that the suitability of the site for new housing development is assessed as part of the Local Plan process. With regards to Green Belt, Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that: "The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence." Paragraph 80 of the NPPF states that Green Belt serves the following five purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;</li> <li>- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;</li> <li>- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;</li> <li>- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and</li> <li>- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</li> </ul>	S/3.1 The Green Belt

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>Fairhurst wish to note that existing built development is located to the south, west and north of the Eastfield House site. The site is a pocket of greenfield land between Eastfield House, the allotments and East Farm Cottages which could be suitable for limited, sensitively designed housing development. The sensitive development of this land could read as an extension to the existing built development adjacent to the roundabout and serve to provide a logical townscape between Earsden and Wellfield. Critically, Fairhurst note that planning permission has already been granted for a significant strategic housing development to the east of the allotments and that the development of the land adjacent to Eastfield House provides an opportunity to form a more logical, defensible Green Belt boundary which follows the existing field boundary of the Eastfield House site, the allotments and the site to the west of the allotments which benefits from planning permission for housing. Fairhurst have below considered the development of the site against the five purposes of Green Belt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restricting sprawl – Based on the existing built environment which surrounds the site on three sides and the recently approved housing site to the east of the allotments, Fairhurst consider that the site adjacent to Eastfield House could be developed up to the north western field boundary without resulting in an unacceptable impact in terms of urban sprawl.</li> <li>• Merging of neighbouring towns – It is not considered that the development of the site would directly result in the merging of any neighbouring towns. The sensitive development of the land could read as an extension to the existing built development adjacent to the roundabout and serve to provide a logical townscape between Earsden and Wellfield.</li> <li>• Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – Based on the characteristics of the site and its scale in the context of the wider countryside to the north, Fairhurst consider that the development of the site would have limited encroachment upon the countryside.</li> <li>• Preserving the setting and special character of historic towns – Fairhurst do not consider that the development of the site would have an adverse impact on the setting and special character of any historic town.</li> <li>• Assisting in urban regeneration – Fairhurst recognise that the site is greenfield and that the emerging Local Plan seeks to prioritise brownfield development. However, the revocation of the former North East Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and the introduction of the NPPF, results in the removal of targets for brownfield land development and adds weight to importance of the delivery and</li> </ul>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					viability of housing development. Fairhurst consider that it is clear from the evidence base of the Consultation Draft Local Plan that not all of the housing requirements can be accommodated on deliverable brownfield sites. Fairhurst consider that the development of the Eastfield House site could provide developer contributions towards the regeneration of nearby settlements. Fairhurst consider that there is no evidence presented to suggest that the development of the site would have an adverse impact on urban regeneration.	
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	CPRE North East	LPCD6573	Yes	We welcome the Council's commitment to the purposes of the strategic Green Belt (Policy #/3:1) and the fact that it sees no need to propose Green Belt deletions to meet its development aspirations.	S/3.1 The Green Belt
408348	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	The Coal Authority	LPCD4088	0	Test of Soundness Positively Prepared- Yes Justified - Yes Effective - Yes Consistency to NPPF - Yes Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - Yes Support - Policy DM/3.2 refers to national policy as set out in 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), the Local Plan is consistent with the NPPF and is not seeking to impose more onerous policy requirements, and as such the policy is supported. Reason -The Local Plan is consistent with advice in paragraphs 79 to 92 of the NPPF	DM/3.2 Development with the Green Belt
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6175	0	Whilst the Agency has no particular comment, it is generally supportive of the restrictions placed on development within the Green Belt, which generally tends to be less sustainably accessible.	DM/3.2 Development with the Green Belt
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3161	0	DM/3.2 Development with the Green Belt - title should say within Green Belt? Archaeological work will be required for all developments in the Green Belt.	DM/3.2 Development with the Green Belt
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife	LPCD6042	0	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.	DM/3.2 Development with the

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
		Trust				Green Belt
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes (Newcastle )	LPCD6012	0	We are supportive of the proposal to identify land for development at plan review, provided it does not impact on housing delivery in the Plan period. The Council must ensure that this review safeguards sufficient land which endures well beyond the Plan period to meet the objectively assessed housing need. Triggers should be introduced which would activate a full or partial review of the Plan to determine whether the release of safeguarded land is needed. This would add flexibility to the policy to ensure there is a sufficient supply of land available to meet the housing need over the plan period. Triggers could include: lack of a five year supply or increased need for housing.	S/3.3 Safeguarded Land
808367	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	landowner	LPCD5706	No	The following paragraphs set out our client's (Mr G Oliver) response in respect of safeguarded land. No detail has been provided as to how much land is proposed to be safeguarded or where, and consequently meaningful comments cannot be made until further clarity has been provided. We therefore reserve the right to comment further on safeguarded land when more detail is provided.	S/3.3 Safeguarded Land
805135	POLITICAL PARTY	North Tyneside Green Party	LPCD3395	No	The borough of North Tyneside is fortunate in encompassing quite a large area of undeveloped land, most of which is Safeguarded at present and therefore available for development at some time in the future. Much of this land includes what have been identified as 'buffer' zones between what were in the past separate townships. Much of the land is cash-cropped or used for grazing. Some has electricity pylons on it which means it is not suitable for housing. The NT Green Party would like to see this Safeguarded Land (a) designated into different timescale parcels of availability for housing or other development possible use eg within 2 years, 2 -4 years, 4 -6 years etc (b) and those areas currently identified as buffer zones to be declared Green Belt in order to secure this open land between towns for the future. A Green Belt area between North Shields and Monkseaton should also be designated in order to preserve that important area of open space. Use of Safeguarded Land i. Environmental enhancement Consideration should be given to the use of the safeguarded land. By putting timescales for possible development on the land it allows tenants to have greater security of tenure and can encourage better land use and maintenance. At present fencing and hedgerows in much of this open space are poorly maintained. Better maintenance would provide better environments for wildlife encouraging greater amount and diversity and make it more attractive for people using paths. Provision for this responsibility should be put in to tenancy	S/3.3 Safeguarded Land

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					agreements and support provided for accessing DEFRA or other grants for this purpose. ii. Allotments and smallholdings Some of this land could also be made available as allotments and smallholdings for market gardening. Growing vegetables and flowers for local markets would contribute to carbon reduction, increase environmental diversity on land currently cash-cropped, provide some employment and could provide a resource for schools for education of young people about where our food comes from.	
755686	BUSINESS GROUP	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4594	In part	The HBF is supportive of the principle of identifying safeguarded land for development at plan review, however this must be read in conjunction with the above comments concerning the Green Belt. To provide flexibility within the plan it is advised that the Council introduce triggers which would require a full or partial review of the plan, in such cases the need to release safeguarded land should be considered. It is advised that the lack of a five year supply or an increased need for housing may be such triggers.	S/3.3 Safeguarded Land
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6179	0	The Agency appreciates the intentions of safeguarding land to prevent sterilisation and ensure that there is sufficient land available to deliver future development beyond the plan period. Should future development come forward within such locations then the Agency will require the implications of such development to be considered at the appropriate time, as and when the plan is revised or a future plan is developed and includes the safeguarded land for development.	S/3.3 Safeguarded Land
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6136	Yes	Policy DM/3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land should not be allowed where it would unjustifiably harm the significance or setting of a heritage asset.	DM/3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6183	0	As stated in response to policy S3.3 above, the Agency would not expect any significant development to come forward within the plan period on any safeguarded land and therefore the future development intentions for such locations should be considered at the appropriate time. However, should significant development proposals come forward within Safeguarded Land areas, then such proposals should be supported by a Transport Assessment / Statement and will need to consider the implications of the development proposed on existing transport infrastructure, including the SRN, and include any measures which may be required to mitigate its impact. The Agency will	DM/3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					consider such proposals at the appropriate time through the development management process.	
808367	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	landowner	LPCD5707	No	The following paragraph sets out our client's (Mr G Oliver) comments in respect of this policy. As per our response to S/3.3, given that the amount and location of potential safeguarded land has not yet been proposed, it is difficult to provide meaningful comments on this policy. Our client reserves the right to comment further once details are released..	DM/3.4 Development within the Safeguarded Land
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6137	Yes	I am pleased to see specific policy in respect of Killingworth Open Break.	AS/3.5 Killingworth Open Break
473231	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	landowner	LPCD5033	0	The Burke family owns the land below on the East side of the road between Forest Hall and Killingworth. It is not part of the Green Belt. Development if this site for 60 dwellings offers some limited development, which does not affect the setting of Killingworth Village.	AS/3.5 Killingworth Open Break
805135	COUNCILLOR	North Tyneside Green Party	LPCD3248	0	We welcome the Council's commitment to Neighbourhood Planning (para 4.72) but regret that there is no recognition that residents in neighbourhoods usually need support for developing these. We would like to see some commitment of resources to support the creation of such initiatives.	S/4.1 Supporting Neighbourhood Planning
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6186	0	The Agency has no particular comment, but is generally supportive of the Neighbourhood Planning approach. The Agency is happy to participate in the Neighbourhood Planning process as and when it is required.	S/4.1 Supporting Neighbourhood Planning
805135	COUNCILLOR	North Tyneside Green Party	LPCD3385	0	NT Green Party welcome the Councils commitment to Neighbourhood Planning (para 4.72) but regret that there is no recognition that residents in neighbourhoods usually need support for developing these. We would like to see some commitment of resources to support the creation of such initiatives.	S/4.1 Supporting Neighbourhood Planning
805832	LANDOWNER/BUSINESS	Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4166	In part	The success and failures of North Shields Neighbourhood plan should be assessed before supporting further neighbourhood plans. An emphasis on wider planning ideals and ideas rather than NIMBYism would help communities really gain from the process. In addition the consultation should appropriate methods that really engage with the community otherwise it the product is not representational of the neighbourhood a problem with the 'Big Society' process	S/4.1 Supporting Neighbourhood Planning

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					well covered in the press.	
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6693	0	The general objectives of the economic development policies of the Local Plan are supported by BPL (Banks Property Ltd), with the caveat that the economic and housing policies of the Local Plan are mutually dependent and in order to achieve the economic aspirations of the plan, the Council should seek to accommodate its full, objectively assessed needs for housing development over the plan period.	5 Economic Development
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6621	0	It is considered that this section of the document needs to be informed by an up to date Employment Land Review (ELR) which is due to be completed soon. This will provide a stronger and more relevant starting point when assessing the future development needs of the borough and where they can be accommodated. This point is particularly relevant as a major part of the NTLP's vision is to grow the local economy.	5 Economic Development
546048	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Port of Tyne	LPCD5138	0	Context Once world-renowned for coal exports the Port has diversified in recent times to ensure it adapts and can keep pace with the global economy and its customers' varying needs. It is now the UK's largest car exporter, the fifth largest in Europe; the fourth largest coal importer in the UK, with volumes of imported coal having increased to the highest levels in recent times, and one of the largest handlers of wood pellet in the world. It operates an award-winning International Passenger Terminal for ferries and cruise ships, a busy container terminal and a UK wide distribution network with a fleet of more than 180 trucks and trailers. In summary the Port's five commercial business areas extend to include Conventional & Bulk Cargoes, Car Terminals, Cruise & Ferries, Logistics and Estates. Three of these business areas, Car Terminals, Cruise and Ferries and Estates, operate on the north bank of the Tyne and the operations can be summarised as follows; + Car Terminal - imports and exports are handled for VW and other manufacturers through a transhipment terminal on the north side of the River. Nissan is currently mostly handled from Tyne Dock on the south bank. + Estates - the Port's Estates business manages a growing portfolio of commercial properties and land holdings. The Port is also currently marketing its land and services to the offshore wind turbine manufacturing sector and power generators which each require expertise in handling and storage of the new renewable fuel, wood pellet.	5 Economic Development

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>+ Cruise and Ferries- the cruise and ferry operations operate exclusively within North Tyneside on the north bank of the River Tyne. These five business areas contributed £484 million to GVA in 2012, an increase of 3.6% from 2011.</p> <p>It is critical to the future success of the Port that it is able to successfully operate each of its businesses. Whilst the majority of the Port's operations can be carried out using its established permitted development rights certain developments still require planning permission, including certain estates related works. The Port, therefore, wishes to ensure that the emerging policies continue to support its existing operations whilst at the same time allowing for the opportunity to diversify into new areas of business including low carbon and renewables.</p> <p>Economy In the context of the above the Port is concerned that the emerging policies in the Local Plan Consultation Draft focus primarily on 'advanced engineering, low carbon, renewable, marine and off shore technology and manufacturing' within the River Tyne North Bank Area to the disadvantage of other economic uses. This extends from the former Swan Hunter ship yard to the Port of Tyne's ferry terminal and, therefore, includes a significant area of the Port of Tyne's land holdings on the north bank of the Tyne as shown on the attached plan. The Port is, therefore, seeking greater recognition of the contribution made by its existing business operations.</p>	
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6189	0	<p>The Agency is generally supportive of the strategy for delivering sustainable economic growth in the Borough. However, given the focus on delivering new office and business development in the A19(T) economic corridor and seeking to utilise the Borough's access to national road connections, there is the potential for this strategy to have a significant impact on the SRN, which will need to be fully understood and mitigated where necessary. Whilst the Agency notes the schemes identified in the IDP and Policy S/10.3 are intended to support the Plan's proposals, including the strategy for economic growth. Given that the final allocations are still to be determined, further consideration will need to be given to the impact on and the requirements of supporting infrastructure, as and when the site allocations have been finalised. This will help to ensure that no additional measures are required, or that where they are required, they are capable of mitigating the impact and ensure that the economic growth strategy can be delivered.</p>	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
396269	GOVERNMENT	English	LPCD6138	Yes	Policy S.5.1 draws attention to the role of the Borough's heritage assets in	S/5.1 :

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	AGENCY	Heritage			promoting its cultural offer. It should be noted, in addition, that the historic environment can also improve the overall image and competitiveness of the Borough across all business sectors helping to confer advantage in an increasingly global economic market.	Economic Growth Strategy
808279	HOUSING DEVELOPER	Bett Homes	LPCD5746	In part	The General Objectives of the Economic Development Policies in the Local Plan are supported, with the caveat that the economic and housing policies of the Local Plan are mutually dependent and in order to achieve the economic aspirations of the Plan, the Council should seek to accommodate its full, objectively assessed needs for housing development over the plan period.	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD6586	Yes	Our Client acknowledges and supports Policy S/5.1 d)i, which recognises the potential for major logistics development on sites which take advantage of the Borough's excellent road connections. It is considered that under such a policy framework, the development of our Client's site adjacent to the A1/ A19 Interchange would be strongly supported. Policy S/5.1 c)i. recognises the potential for office and business investment development in the A19 (T) economic corridor. This corridor is defined on the proposals 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 could be appropriate for office and business investment and 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"	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
806149	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	New River	LPCD4311	Yes	NRR agree that retail and leisure development have a role in facilitating economic growth and support Policy S/5.1(Economic Growth Strategy) which seeks to "Attract a range of innovative and creative businesses to retail, leisure and office development within the Borough's town centres".	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
805376	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Wet 'n' Wild Enterprises Limited in Administration c/o PwC	LPCD3562	In part	Our client supports the approach to encouraging economic growth as detailed in Policy S/5.1. In relation to section a) Retail Leisure and Tourism however they would however request the following amendments to criterion i: "Attract a range of innovative and creative businesses to retail, leisure and office developments within the Borough's town centres and existing out of centre retail locations." Such an approach would be in line with the wording of Policy DM/6.10 Our client also welcomes the support detailed in Policy S/5.1 towards "the creation, enhancement and expansion of tourist attractions, visitor	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					accommodation and infrastructure". It is noted however that the remainder of this policy concentrates on the heritage attractions of the Borough. Reference should also be made to other forms of tourist attractions such as Royal Quays which plays an import role in the Borough's overall tourism offer.	
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4598	0	Policy S/5.1 supports economic growth including "advanced Engineering, low carbon, renewable, marine and off-shore technology and manufacturing", including the development of marine and renewable sectors of manufacturing in the River Tyne North Bank Area. As set out above, whilst our Client broadly supports this strategy, it is considered that the boundaries of the 'North Bank' Employment Area should be amended to exclude the former St. Gobain site.	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
546048	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Port of Tyne	LPCD5142	In part	The Policy as drafted fails to lend support to existing Class B2 and B8 businesses within the North Bank area, instead focusing on the marine and renewable sectors and major logistics. Whilst the Port of Tyne is supportive of the introduction of these uses, in particular to the Enterprise Zone area, it continues to offer accommodation to a number of more general business and industrial operations along the north bank of the Tyne. The Port considers that their contribution should be acknowledged within the Policy which it expects to continue during the lifespan of the emerging Local Plan. Paragraph 5.15 goes some way to identifying the wider business interests of the Port but this should be expanded to cover each of the Port's business areas and be reflected in Policy. For example, the Port itself continues to manage and operate two landholdings on the north bank at Howdon and Marston Quays, shown on the attached plans. As part of the Port's business plan these sites are to be refurbished to ensure more efficient and evolving uses in the future. Whilst this may include space for off-shore engineering in the medium term this could also accommodate general industrial and business uses and the Port's cargo business. Whilst supporting Policy DM/5.3 (Development Affecting New and Existing Employment Land and Buildings) states its support for B1, B2 and B8 uses on employment land it is understood that this relates to specific employment sites identified on the proposals map and does not generally extend to the North Bank area. Clarification of the Councils support for more general industrial and employment uses within this area at Policy S/5.1 would, therefore, be welcomed by the Port. As an alternative to expanding out the existing policy the Port would very much welcome a Port specific policy that acknowledges its operational requirements with in the context of the overall vision for the North Bank area, in line with the approach being progressed now	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>with South Tyneside Council. Such an approach also presents the opportunity to highlight the Ports permitted development rights which are not currently referred to in the draft document. Obviously port related development can be carried out as permitted development under the terms of Part 17 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, and this provides the Port with the flexibility to operate in Tyne and Wear at present. However, in some instances it is necessary for the Port to apply for permission or liaise with the local planning authority regarding the introduction of certain uses to the site that complement Port related activities but do not strictly fall within the uses specified within the GPDO. In certain cases these uses have also fallen outside the definition of Class B uses as defined by the Use Classes Order (UCO), for example certain sui generis uses. The Port has already responded positively to dramatic changes in market conditions over the last 30-40 years and pursued diversification and new opportunities to develop a growing and sustainable business. The Port has aspirations to expand the business over the forthcoming years. This requires both intensification and more efficient use of the existing land which could extend to include employment uses that do not fall within Class B. A Port specific policy could respond to and support such circumstances whilst at the same time acknowledging the particular operation of the Port's business and the contribution that other industrial or business related uses may make.</p>	
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	CPRE	LPCD6531	In part	<p>We question the need for further office development, in view of the number of vacant offices that at present exist in the Borough, as well as in Newcastle city centre and elsewhere. The Council should have regard to the need to prevent excessive commercial development giving rise to congestion and hence stimulating a demand for new or improved roads, especially along the A 19 Corridor. We suggest that the Council should also reaffirm here its commitment to sustainable transport in this section. While Policies DM/10.3 and 10/4 are welcome in that they refer to walking and cycling, there should be a stronger statement that these are a priority, as is required in the NPPF.</p>	S/5.1 : Economic Growth Strategy
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4656	0	<p>It is unclear how the Employment Land Section and the Employment Land Study 2013 have considered the Smith's Dock Site. As previously stated, based on the implemented residential planning permission and the outline planning permission granted in April 2013, the site should not be considered as an employment land allocation. The site as part of a major development will,</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					however, deliver major employment opportunities.	
639692	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	W.B. Kerr Luxury Coaches Ltd	LPCD274	Yes	none given	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4600	0	Policy S/5.2 identifies that there is a need for up to 170 hectares of new employment land over the plan period and identifies how the range of employment sites to meet this need will be selected. It notes that there is currently 210 hectares of employment land available for development and that there is therefore a requirement to reduce the amount of land allocated for employment purposes by 40 hectares. For the reasons outlined above, our Client would recommend that the former St Gobain site is excluded from the proposed North Bank Employment Area and is instead allocated for housing. This would help to reduce the oversupply of employment land as outlined in Policy S/5.2 and the additional housing would complement the neighbouring job creation. Notwithstanding the above, our Client understands that an up-to-date Employment Land Review is currently being prepared and is likely to be published early in 2014. Our Client reserves the right to provide further comments regarding this Policy, once the up-to-date evidence base is published.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD6587	0	Policy S/5.2 identifies that there is a need for up to 170ha of new employment land over the plan period and identifies how the range of employment sites to meet this need will be selected. We understand that an up-to-date Employment Land Review is currently being prepared and is likely to be published early in 2014. Our Client reserves the right to provide further comments regarding this Policy, once the up-to-date evidence base is published. Paragraph 5.21 of the supporting text clarifies that potential employment sites have been identified for consultation. It is noted that at this stage our Client's site to the south of the A1/A19 Interchange has not been considered as a potential employment site. It is considered that the site should be included in future drafts of the Local Plan as an employment allocation, delivering around 250,000 sqft of employment floorspace, given that: - The site is uniquely located at a key strategic junction of the A1/ A19 and would be extremely attractive to operators generating jobs and investment for the local economy; - The site is within walking distance of existing facilities and residential areas	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>within Seaton Burn ensuring that it is sustainable and the economic benefits of the development would be felt by local businesses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussions with the Highways Agency have confirmed that if it became necessary to widen the stretch of the A1 near Seaton Burn, this could be accommodated within the existing footprint of the A1 so no land would be needed from the site. The development of the site for employment uses would therefore not have an impact on the delivery of potential future improvements to the road network;</li> <li>- The development of the site would not have a detrimental impact on the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF and as such the site could be removed from the Green Belt;</li> <li>- There are no physical constraints identified that would prevent the site from being developed; and</li> <li>- There is potential for the development of the site to cross fund the approved sports and leisure facilities at the neighbouring Seaton Burn Recreation Ground. This will deliver significant health, employment, financial and environmental benefits and is supported by the local community and Councillors.</li> </ul>	
807164	BUSINESS	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4882	0	<p>NWL supports the requirement for evidence to support a sustainability appraisal for each site and that flood risk will be one of the areas considered. We would be happy to provide data on sewerage network capacity to inform those sites emerging from your Employment Land Review.</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
768554	GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION	Highways Agency	LPCD6192	0	<p>The Agency notes that a 170ha of land is required to meet the employment land needs for the plan period, based on the conclusions of the employment land review. However it is noted that the council is currently reviewing its employment land review, and whilst it is anticipated that no further land will be required, it will be important for the Agency to know which sites will ultimately be taken forward in the Plan to address the need and which should form the basis of future assessments to determine the impacts of development and any mitigation requirements. The Agency therefore welcomes that a requirement of the preferred site selection process will be to ensure that only deliverable and viable sites are taken forward which are capable of being sustainably accessible and can be accommodated by existing highways or can deliver any required mitigation measures to address any impact. Again, any additional measures that may be required following an assessment of the Plan's final quantum and development distribution will need to be agreed with the Agency should there</p>	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					be implications for the SRN and appropriately reflected in Policy and the IDP.	
470965	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Manners	LPCD6705	0	We understand that North Tyneside Council has a significant supply of employment land available in the Borough which extends beyond the period required for the Local Plan. In November 2011 we calculated this as an implied supply of more than twice the amount required for the 16 year period of the draft Core Strategy (2012-27). This position is yet to be demonstrated to be inaccurate as part of any updated employment land review.	S/5.2 : Provision of Land for Employment Development
768554	GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION	Highways Agency	LPCD6194	0	Whilst the Agency does not have any particular concerns with this policy, it will be important to ensure that any change in the trip generation pattern, resulting from an alternative use on an employment site will need to be appropriately considered.	DM/5.3 : Development Affecting Employment Land and Buildings
807438	PLANNING CONSULTANCY	Rapleys	LPCD5120	Yes	Support Policy DM/5.3 Development Affecting Employment Land and Buildings. This policy offers the necessary flexibility, as required by paragraph 22 of NPPF, to allow alternative development where this does not result in the unacceptable loss of an operating businesses or result in an excessive reduction in the supply of land for employment use. It is essential that this, or a similar policy, is maintained to ensure that where employment use is no longer required, or suitable, on a site, that full use can be made of the potential of the site to meet other aspirations of the plan, particularly where these sites are in accessible, sustainable locations. We consider that Albion House (Site 64) is such a site, which should be considered for alternative uses that contribute to the role and health of North Shields town centre.	DM/5.3 : Development Affecting Employment Land and Buildings
768554	Government Organistaion	Highways Agency	LPCD6197	0	As stated above, whilst the Agency again does not have any particular concerns with this policy, it will be important to ensure that any change in the trip generation pattern, resulting from locating an employment use on a none employment site will need to be appropriately considered. In addition, it will be necessary to assess how such proposals will affect the delivery of the Plan's allocations, which should have been assessed in terms of their impact on supporting transport and infrastructure.	DM/5.4 Employment Land Development Outside Identified or Existing Employment Land

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6199	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the intentions to support further employment development within the Enterprise Zones and at sites along the north bank of the River Tyne. Notwithstanding this, it will still be important to ensure that such development can be sustainably delivered alongside the Plan's other development proposals, without detrimentally impacting on the operation of the SRN. As already mentioned, the Agency will be able to give further consideration to such impacts as and when the preferred site allocations, and the final quantum and distribution of development is known.	AS/5.5 River Tyne North Bank
546048	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Port of Tyne	LPCD5213	In part	Policy AS/5.5 complements Strategic Policy 5.1 whilst being specific to the River Tyne North Bank. The policy goes on to place a specific focus on certain locations including the 'Land at Port of Tyne, part of the North East Low Carbon Enterprise Zone.' The supporting text at paragraphs 5.28 and 5.29 highlights the working relationship with the Port of Tyne to realise the vision for the Enterprise Zone. For the reasons set out above the Port is concerned that these policies have the potential to restrict the Port's existing commercial operations within its land holdings along the North Bank. Whilst the Port is fully supportive of the Council's ambitions to develop this area for advanced engineering, manufacturing and renewables, and is fully committed to the Enterprise Zone, it requests that the policies introduce flexibility in response to its existing operations, and that of its tenants. This includes the car terminals, cruise and ferries operations and estates business. To this end, as detailed above, the Port requests that clarification is included within strategic policy S/5.1 to support the existing Port business with additional supporting text to provide the context with regards to the Ports permitted development rights. Alternatively, and more preferable to the Port, would be a policy specific to the Port. This approach would set the context for the more detailed policies including AS/5.5.	AS/5.5 River Tyne North Bank
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4604	0	It is noted that Policy AS/5.5 refers to development being focussed on 5 specific sites, which are defined on the 'Policies Map'. These sites do not appear to be labelled on the draft Proposals Map and our Client therefore reserves the right to comment on the 5 specific sites, once their exact location is clear. Based on the description of the 5 sites, it is possible that site c. Land Adjacent to Heraeus Quartz Ltd is the St. Gobain site. If this is the case, our Client reiterates the comments noted above, in terms of the recommendation to exclude the former St. Gobain site from the North Bank Employment Area and requests that Site C. is removed from Policy AS/5.5.	AS/5.5 River Tyne North Bank

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
396306	LOCAL AUTHORITY	South Tyneside Council,	LPCD2494	Yes	In this context of the A19(T) Tyne Tunnels and Shields Ferry strategic infrastructure connections, and the River Tyne wildlife corridor we support the associated A19(T) Economic Corridor Policy AS/5.5 and supporting text, together with the need to enhance transport infrastructure throughout this strategic growth corridor.	AS/5.5 River Tyne North Bank
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6202	0	The Agency acknowledges the intentions to focus new employment development at the A19(T) economic corridor and as stated in response to Policy S/5.1, this strategy has the potential to significantly impact on the operation and safety of the SRN. Whilst the Agency is supportive of Parts a. and b. and the intentions to improve public transport infrastructure and access, and the focus on providing office development within close proximity to the metro stations, until a decision has been made on the final site allocations and the quantum of development to be proposed across the A19(T) corridor, the potential implications for the SRN cannot robustly assessed. Therefore, the Agency is not currently in a position to determine whether the network is fully capable of supporting the economic strategy along this corridor or whether further improvements may be required to mitigate its impact, in addition to what has already been proposed in the Plan and supporting IDP. In accordance with DfT Circular 02/2013, The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development, where future strategic growth will have implications for the SRN, the Agency will require any capacity enhancements or infrastructure required to deliver this growth to be identified within the Local Plan. This should help to provide greater certainty and viability to the delivery of the Plans proposals and to the delivery of the infrastructure improvements required to support and deliver the strategy.	AS/5.6 A19(T) Economic Corridor
546048	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Port of Tyne	LPCD5214	No	We have noted that the Corridor extends to the east of the A19(T) and along the north bank of the River Tyne up to the Port's land holdings at the Ferry Terminal. The policy, therefore, includes the Port's Howdon Yard which is intended for refurbishment in the short term for port related activities, possibly bulk cargoes. It also includes existing land and premises to the east of the Yard let to the Port's tenants, including Velva Liquids (Simon Storage) and Northumbrian Water. Given the policies emphasis on office development we would question the inclusion of this land within the corridor. As suggested above we request that policy S/5.1 is expanded to support a range of employment and business uses in this area and that the land is excluded from this policy. This would then allow	AS/5.6 A19(T) Economic Corridor

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					policy AS/5.6 to focus on office related development only, if this is still what is desired by the authority.	
587121	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Nexus	LPCD2422	0	Policy AS 5.6 proposes best practice by prioritising office-type use within 500 metres of Metro stations. There are similar statements about prioritising Metro and public transport accessibility, for example in policy DM 6.10, but we would like to see a similar explicit corridor/distance prioritisation within other policies in the Local Plan, so as to directly encourage increased catchments for public transport.	AS/5.6 A19(T) Economic Corridor
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6140	0	Paragraphs 5.35-5.39 deal with Business Support, Skills, and Training. The acute shortage of skilled workers able to conserve and restore buildings, furniture and interiors here in the north east presents a serious threat to our historic environment. Through, for example, the Heritage Skills Initiative, English Heritage helps promote the development of those necessary skills. The annual Heritage Skills Fair held at Tynemouth Station is just one part of this programme of activity. I would suggest that this aspect of skills development be recognised and supported through this section of the Plan.	5 Business support, skills, training
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4657	0	<p>DM/4.6: Employment and Skills of the Consultation Draft of the Local Plan states that:</p> <p>Proposals for major new developments will be required to contribute to the creation of local employment opportunities and support growth in the overall proportion of local residents in education or training through: a) promotion of the development and expansion of education facilities, particularly to support education training and apprenticeships in association with advanced engineering, manufacturing and the off-shore, marine and renewable sector. b) reach an agreement between the Council, developers and new occupiers of businesses premises to promote local recruitment and training targeted at the advanced level skills that residents would need to gain from the new employment opportunities created.</p> <p>PfP and Fairhurst recognise that training and apprenticeships in the engineering, manufacturing and the off-shore, marine and renewables sector align with strategic priorities for NTC. However, the above planning policy would need to be implemented with flexibility in development management procedures. Fairhurst recognise that NTC wish to prioritise the sectors in which opportunities</p>	DM/5.7 : Employment and Skills

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					are provided. However, it should be noted that, as part of some developments, it will not be feasible to provide opportunities in engineering, manufacturing and the off-shore, marine and renewable sectors and therefore training and apprenticeships may have to be accepted in other sectors such as service industries. In some instances, such as Smith's Dock, there will be significant job, training and apprenticeship opportunities in a wide range of sectors. This has been acknowledged throughout discussions with officers as part of the current local plan process.	
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6622	No	DM/4.6: Employment and Skills: As stated earlier in these representations, 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 namely that it should be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.	DM/5.7 : Employment and Skills
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6205	0	The Agency has no particular comment, but is generally supportive of the policy and its drive to encourage local employment closer to where people live, which should help to reduce the need to travel further distances for employment and thereby help to reduce private car use.	DM/5.7 : Employment and Skills
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes (Newcastle )	LPCD6013	0	<p>Policy DM/4.6 requires all major new development schemes, of more than 10 units to contribute to the creation of local employment opportunities and support growth of the overall proportion of local residents in education or training. BDW does not feel this requirement should be made a mandatory planning requirement by the Council. The requirement is not realistic and would undermine the viability of such sites, impacting on housing delivery; many housebuilders already undertake local recruitment and training and the 2010 Affordable Housing Viability Assessment indicates viability issues with proposed levels of affordable housing alone, without the introduction of further costs. The requirement to create employment opportunities and increase education and training, would not fulfil the legal tests for S106 agreements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Necessary to make development in acceptable terms</li> <li>- Directly related to development</li> <li>- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development</li> </ul> <p>We suggest that the Council carefully considers the implications of this policy whilst updating their viability evidence base. In line with NPPF para 173 and 177,</p>	DM/5.7 : Employment and Skills

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>the cumulative impact of all the Plans policies and obligations must be included. The Council should also consult the house building industry on policies such as these to ensure the assumptions being made are realistic. Instead of introducing this policy as a direct requirement for housebuilders, the Council should consider funding this requirement through CIL or New Homes Bonus. Again, investigating the impact these requirements could have on viability.</p>	
755686	NATIONAL ORGANISATION	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4596	In part	<p>The policy requires major new developments (defined in paragraph 5.39 of the plan as residential schemes of 10 units or more) to contribute to the creation of local employment opportunities and support growth in the overall proportion of local residents in education or training. It should be noted that many housing developers already undertake local recruitment and training, however this should not be a mandatory planning requirement as it does not appear realistic that such a requirement would fulfil the legal tests for section 106 agreements in that it is; 1. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms 2. directly related to the development; and 3. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. If the Council wishes to pursue such an ambition it is recommended that this should be funded through any future Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or New Homes Bonus. In addition in compliance with NPPF paragraphs 173 to 177 the Council would need to test these requirements for their cumulative impacts upon development viability. The current 2010 Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (AHVA) indicates viability issues with the proposed levels of affordable housing alone. The introduction of further costs upon the development industry is likely to stall development coming forward. It is noted that the Council is currently updating its viability evidence base. It is recommended, in conformity with NPPF paragraphs 173 to 177, that this includes the cumulative impact of all plan policies and obligations. It is also advised that the housing industry is consulted upon this work to ensure any assumptions used are realistic.</p>	DM/5.7 : Employment and Skills
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6693	0	<p>Draft Policy DM/4.6 relates to employment and skills and requires major new development to contribute towards the creation of local employment opportunities and support growth in the overall proportion of local residents in education or training. Overall, the Council's aspiration with this policy is understood although it is not considered that this is the correct arena within which to secure such employment opportunities. In this respect, it is considered that funding towards employment opportunities and training would be more appropriately secured through part of a Community Infrastructure Levy</p>	DM/5.7 : Employment and Skills

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>contribution which would represent a more comprehensive and long term solution to training delivery. In particular, the securing of employment training through Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act is not likely to comply with the legal tests which are namely as follows: “ Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; and “ Directly related to the development; and “ Fairly and reasonably relates in scale and kind to the development. It is a legal requirement for each of the above tests to be complied with as part of any Section 106 Agreement, and it is considered highly unlikely that this could be achieved with the draft policy.</p>	
805724	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Horton Estate	LPCD4059	In part	<p>Horton Estate own land on the headland close to St Mary's lighthouse including the access road and the car parks. Horton Estate agree that this area needs to be protected and note the area is shown as Green Belt / Wildlife Corridor / Local Wildlife Site on the Local Plan Proposals Map. Additionally the National Cycle Route is shown as passing through. Horton Estate consider there is opportunity for enhancement in this area which currently has limited facilities. Horton Estate consider a well designed and appropriately sited cafe / information centre could amongst other things enhance the area visually and improve its attractiveness to visitors. In the circumstances Horton Estate would welcome the opportunity to discuss this possibility with the Council. Following on from the above Horton Estate own land to the north and west of Whitley Bay Golf Club as shown outlined in blue on the attached plan. Representations have previously been submitted to the Coastal Area Action Plan 2012 and the Core Strategy Preferred Options 2010 suggesting that this area has potential to contribute positively to the delivery of Green Belt objectives whilst supporting recreation and tourism led regeneration in the Coastal Zone. Possibilities noted include the potential to provide further recreation / tourism opportunities including for example equestrian development, a country park, extension of Whitley Bay golf course or specific types of holiday accommodation. Since the previous representations were submitted the NPPF has come into force and para 81 specifically requires that local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt for example by looking for opportunities to provide access and providing opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation. In the circumstances Horton Estate would welcome the opportunity for discussions with the Council as to future of this area.</p>	AS/5.8 Tourism at the Coast
510094		0 Natural	LPCD6751	0	This policy should be amended to ensure tourism developments at the coast do	AS/5.8

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
		England			<p>not adversely affect the coastal SSSI, SPA and Ramsar (see above).</p> <p>“Proposals for new or the extension of existing attractions, facilities and accommodation, which do not adversely affect the coastal SSSIs or Natura 2000 nature conservation sites, will be actively supported to maintain and enhance an attractive, vibrant and viable seafront offer.</p> <p>Without specific reference to the protection of coastal wildlife sites, this policy potentially contradicts those that seek to protect the natural environment.</p> <p>The supporting HRA and SA should examine whether further tourism developments, which increase recreational activities during winter months, will adversely affect the interest features of the coastal nature conservation sites. If effects are likely the plan may require detailed mitigation measures.</p>	Tourism at the Coast
396365	NTC	North Tyneside Council	LPCD2012	0	Amend last sentence of text to the following: As this site has the potential to be used by SPA QBS as a roosting site, any use of the site as a temporary events area will only be permitted outside of the wintering bird period to avoid any disturbance. In addition, any proposals that would involve the permanent loss of any part of this site would not be permitted.	AS/5.9 Longsands: Temporary Events Area
510094		0 Natural England	LPCD6752	0	<p>In order to avoid adverse effects on wintering SPA/Ramsar birds, the HRA states that events will only be allowed outside the wintering bird period.</p> <p>Policy AS/4.8 and paragraph 5.44 should be amended to ensure compliance with the HRA and the European Birds Directives.</p> <p>Policy AS/4.8 should state that: “Beaconsfield will be safeguarded for open space but would be considered acceptable for temporary tourism and recreational related activities and appropriate works to support such activities. All activities will be restricted between October and March to avoid impacts on nationally and internationally protected nature conservation interests.”</p> <p>Paragraph 5.44 should state that: “Any such events would need to be of a temporary nature which would be no longer than three months. Longsands Beach is within the Northumbria Coast SPA/Ramsar and Northumberland Coast SSSI and Beaconsfield is a recognised</p>	AS/4.8 Longsands: Temporary Events Area



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					roosting area for some wintering species associated with these nature conservation sites. Therefore activities on Beaconsfield will be restricted during the winter period. The advice of the Biodiversity Officer will be followed when all proposals come forward.”	
396253	DEVELOPER	Northumberland Estates	LPCD2681	0	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 Town Centres and Retail Provision
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6143	Yes	Policy S/6.1 “ I welcome support for schemes which capitalise on the character, distinctiveness and heritage value of the Borough’s town centres.	S/6.1 : Competitive Town Centres and Retail Provision
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6207	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the policy and its encouragement given to maintaining the vitality of town centres (as opposed to unsustainable out of centre locations) which are easily accessible by public transport, walking and cycling. Providing a mix of uses and a range of facilities and services should help to encourage linked trips and reduce the number and distance of journeys required. As such the Agency is particularly supportive of Part f.	S/6.1 : Competitive Town Centres and Retail Provision
806149	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	New River Retail	LPCD4300	In part	On behalf of our client NewRiver Retail (GP3) and NewRiver Retail (Nominee No.3) Ltd (‘NRR’) owners of the Forum Shopping Centre, Wallsend and the Beacon Centre, North Shields, we hereby submit the following representations on the North Tyneside Local Plan, Consultation Draft November 2013. As owners of two shopping centres in the North Tyneside’s main town centres, NRR is a major investor in North Tyneside. NRR support the overall direction of the Plan, and is encouraged by the Council’s continued support of town centres as the focus for retail and leisure activities and in particular, the commitment of the Council to the regeneration on Wallsend Town Centre and North Shields Town Centre. NRR is concerned that the retail policies as currently written do not sufficiently protect planned growth in centres against development which comes forward on edge of centre and out of centre sites. In particular, the Council’s retail policy on out of centre development needs to be strengthened. Conversely, NRR also consider it necessary to make the town	S/6.1 : Competitive Town Centres and Retail Provision

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>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. NRR is generally supportive of the policies for retail and town centres as set out Chapter 6 of the Local Plan. NRR is encouraged by the Council’s priorities for growth and investment as set out in Policy S/6.1 (Competitive Town Centres and Retail Development) and supports town centre redevelopment which would “support the improvement in the range and quality of shops, services and facilities”. NRR support 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. On behalf of our client, NRR, we request to be kept informed about the progress with the North Tyneside Local Plan and wish to reserve our client’s position to make further representations on subsequent LDF documents. We trust that these comments are helpful. Please contact me if you require more information regarding these matters.</p>	
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	CPRE	LPCD6534	In part	<p>Under Policy #DM/6: 1, Retail, we welcome the commitment to concentrating retail development in the town centres. We strongly urge that out of town or edge of town shopping centre developments should be rejected unless the strongest possible case can be made out for them. However, the proposals relating to sustainable transport are weak and we question whether, in Policy #S6/l, it is appropriate that the car should be the first transport mode mentioned.</p>	S/6.1 : Competitive Town Centres and Retail Provision
396253	DEVELOPER	Northumberland Estates	LPCD2682	0	<p>It is acknowledged that the Retail and Leisure Study (2011) provides a helpful indication as to the amount of additional floorspace required over the plan period. However The Northumberland Estates request that Policy S/6.2 be modified to make clear that, while the 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 the retail impact assessment at the point of planning application submission and that there may be scope (eg through clawback of expenditure leakage or growth in expenditure over time) to support additional floorspace over and above that currently identified. It is important that the Plan does not impose artificial limits</p>	S/6.2 Future Retail Demand

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>on the quantum of convenience and comparison floorspace which can come forward in the Borough, particularly as requirements are likely to change over the course of the plan period. We also note that paragraph 6.11 of the Consultation Draft states that, on the basis of the Retail and Leisure Study’s findings, there is no demand for further major leisure developments at present. 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 plan to provide new leisure facilities which meet the needs granted by this growth spending. This is particularly the case given the new and emerging leisure schemes coming forward in nearby local authority areas, including Newcastle City Centre, Gateshead Town Centre and Cramlington, and at the MetroCentre “ which are likely to attract customers from North Tyneside and contribute towards unsustainable travel patterns. It is considered that the site to the west of Northumberland Park District Centre offers significant 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.</p>	
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6209	0	<p>The Agency has no particularly comment to make in relation to the quantum of retail floorspace identified in the policy other than it should prioritise town centres first in accordance with the hierarchy identified in Policy S/6.3. The Borough’s town centres generally provide the best access from public transport, walking and cycling and therefore generally present the most sustainable locations for delivering future retail development.</p>	S/6.2 Future Retail Demand
805376	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Wet 'n' Wild Enterprises Limited in Administration c/o PwC	LPCD3566	0	<p>Our client notes the estimates of future convenience and comparison retail floorspace in the Borough detailed in Policy S/6.2 and welcomes the acknowledgement that additional retail floorspace is required in the Borough over the Plan period to meet future demands. We would question however whether such a simple quantitative assessment of future needs is a robust basis on which to plan for future needs, and whether such an approach accords with guidance in NPPF. As the Council will be aware that NPPF only requires proposals for new out of centre retail proposals to be refused where they result in a “significant adverse impact” on the vitality and viability of any town centre(s), or where there are sequentially preferable sites available that could accommodate the proposed development . The Plan does not appear to have</p>	S/6.2 Future Retail Demand

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>undertaken any such assessment of potential sites and the quantitative need for any retail proposal is only one factor in assessing “impact”. We would also point out that such floorspace figures quickly become out of date and as the Plan acknowledges are not very reliable especially in the longer term It is entirely possible therefore that proposals for retail development may come forward over the plan period that exceed the floorspace figures listed in Policy S/6.2 and would still be acceptable. Individual proposal for out of centre retail development therefore need to be assessed on their own individual merits at the time that planning permission is sought. We would suggest that Policy S/6.2 is deleted and figures relating to quantitative need are incorporated into the supporting text.</p>	
396421	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Station Developments	LPCD4425	0	<p>Signet Planning are instructed on behalf of Station Developments Limited in respect of Tynemouth Station and wish to response to the Local Plan Consultation Draft. By way of context, Station Developments Limited secured planning permission and listed building consent via appeal on 4 February 2011 for development of the eastern concourse area (Appeal reference: APP/W4515/A/10/2133781). The proposed development is the restoration of listed canopy structure and use of part of the Appeal Site for an arts, cultural and market programme, construction of a retail unit and associated car parking and altered vehicular access, station manager's office with associated storage, public library with heritage centre, photographic society, community meeting rooms associated car parking and new vehicular access, public toilets and landscaping. Market conditions have been particularly difficult and the permission has not been implemented due to the prevailing economic conditions although discussions I negotiations are on-going with a number of food retailers regarding the retail element of the scheme. One of the main issues to be debated during the public enquiry was retail impact. The Inspector concluded: 1. There is no persuasive evidence to suggest that the proposal would significantly harm investment in North Shields or any other centre; 2. The effect of the proposal on the vitality and viability of Tynemouth would be positive. Tynemouth is quite a large local centre with some of the features of a district centre. It is poorly served with convenience retail facilities ... The proposed retail unit would provide very good facilities, well related to the centre, especially for Metro users ... but also to the general population of Tynemouth; 3. The impact of the proposals on in-centre trade and on trade in the wider area would not be significantly harmful; 4. The proposed development</p>	S/6.2 Future Retail Demand

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>would be of an appropriate scale in relation to the size of the centre and its role in the hierarchy of centres; 5. There is no material harm to local centres; The impact on Tynemouth's economic and physical regeneration would be positive, enhancing economic activity and leading to the regeneration of an important listed building in the conservation area; 7. Local employment would increase in Tynemouth through jobs generated during construction and the employment created at the complete retail unit; 8. Overall, the effect of the retail element of the proposals would be acceptable. The acceptability of the convenience retail element of the appeal scheme was debated and confirmed by the Inspector. Since that time, there have been no material changes and retail use on the Tynemouth Station site remains acceptable. On that basis, the council can and should allocate part of the Tynemouth Station site, approved for retail use by the appeal decision, for convenience retail provision for Tynemouth. In addition, whilst the 'pod' type units on the western concourse of the station were not included with the appeal application, the units have been marketed for a range of uses including Use Classes A1, A2, A3, D1 and D2 for last couple of years following the council's vacation of the units. However, interest has been limited until more recently and again discussions are now on-going with a number of parties regarding potential uses. The units are fit for use and a range of uses would be acceptable, given the site is within the defined district centre boundary. As such, the units can and should be allocated in the Local Plan for the range of uses listed above which are predominantly town centre uses. This will assist in bringing the units back into viable economic use.</p>	
396253	DEVELOPER	Northumberland Estates	LPCD2683	0	<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. We also acknowledge the recognition at Para. 6.19 of the Consultation Draft that Northumberland Park District Centre has the potential for future expansion, in order to help meet the Borough's overall need for retail provision.</p>	S/6.3 : Hierarchy of Centres
768554	GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION	Highways Agency	LPCD6212	0	<p>The Agency is particularly supportive of the hierarchy of centres set out in the policy. The Borough's town centres generally provide the most sustainable accessible locations for future development with access to sustainable transport, employment, and a diverse range of facilities and services, which can help to facilitate linked trips, reduce congestion and the need to travel. Similarly,</p>	S/6.3 : Hierarchy of Centres

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					the Agency is supportive of utilising the sequential test which should ensure the most sustainably suitable locations are developed as priority over those in less sustainable locations.	
805376	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Wet 'n' Wild Enterprises Limited in Administration c/o PwC	LPCD3569	0	Paragraph 6.20 Out of Centre Retail Areas We note that Paragraph 6.20 fails to make any mention of Royal Quays as an "out of centre" retail location. This omission must be rectified. Royal Quays is a major "out of centre" retail location and plays an important role in the overall retail offer in North Tyneside. It lies in the urban area centrally located between Wallsend and North Shields, and has excellent access by car, bus and Metro. It complements the retail offer in North Shields and Wallsend where, as acknowledged in paragraph 6.17, there is limited scope for significant expansion to meet the identified needs. The only site identified for development in either centre is Site 348 lying to the west of Wallsend Town Centre. Policy AS/ 6.8 of the plan suggests however that this site is better suited to non-retail uses In the absence of any sites suitable for new retail development, in or on the edge of either of these centres, sites such as our client's site ( Site 76 - The former Wet 'n' Wild centre on Coble Dene Way, North Shields), which lies directly adjacent to Royal Quays, provides an excellent opportunity to deliver additional retail convenience and/ or comparison goods floorspace in a sustainable location. Royal Quays is readily accessible from both town centres and further modest retail development in this location is unlikely to have an significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of Wallsend on North Shields.	S/6.3 : Hierarchy of Centres
806149	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	New River Retail	LPCD4312	Yes	Wallsend and North Shields are identified as Town Centres in Policy S6.3 (Hierarchy of Centres), which is considered the most suitable location for town centre uses and development. The hierarchy appears to be appropriate.	S/6.3 : Hierarchy of Centres
396421	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Station Developments	LPCD4418	Yes	We support Policy S/6.3 in respect of Tynemouth being identified in the Hierarchy of Centres as a district centre. We also support the defined district centre boundary as shown on Map 9 on page 61. Tynemouth Station is within the defined boundary and therefore the allocation of the site for retail development complies with the NPPF and can be supported by the council within the Local Plan.	S/6.3 : Hierarchy of Centres
807438	PLANNING CONSULTANCY	Rapleys	LPCD5121	Yes	Support Policy S/6.3 "Hierarchy of Centres" which states that North Shields town centre is at the highest level of the retail/town centre hierarchy and as such we consider that every effort should be made to ensure that its role is consolidated by identifying suitable expansion opportunities, through the inclusion of our client's site (Site 64).	S/6.3 : Hierarchy of Centres

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
806149	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	New River Retail	LPCD4313	In part	<p>Policy DM/6.4 (Town and District Centre Development) reinforces the Council's support of investment and regeneration of defined town centres by advocating town centres as the principal location for retail activity, focusing on the range and quality of retail provision and delivery of high quality active ground floor frontages. The policy title could perhaps more appropriately refer to Primary and Secondary Frontages, as it appears to work alongside other specific town centre policies which for example specifically promote the redevelopment of an area of the town centre. Policy DM/6.4 currently does not permit development in the Primary Shopping Frontage which would result in less than 70% of the frontage being in Class A1 retail use. It also does not allow two non-A1 uses to be adjacent. Whilst the Retail Study recommends that the Primary Shopping Frontage should include a high proportion of retail uses, it does not specify a threshold. NRR consider a requirement for 70% of the frontage in Class A1 use to be too commercially restrictive and is not backed up by evidence. Both the Forum Shopping Centre and Beacon Centre are located within their Town Centre boundary and designated as Primary Shopping Frontage. NRR consider it necessary for Policy DM/6.4 to be 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 NRR recognise 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 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, cafes 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 DM/6.4 should be amended to allow a higher</p>	DM/6.4 : Town and District Centre Development

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					percentage of non-retail uses in the Primary Shopping Frontage based upon clear evidence.	
807438	PLANNING CONSULTANCY	Rapleys	LPCD5125	No	In order to be considered sound, the plan must explore the reasonable alternatives, it is considered that instead of accepting that the North Shields Town centre is constrained, that the redevelopment of existing brownfield sites which may be more suited to alternative use should be considered, particularly the Albion House site (Site 64).	DM/6.4 : Town and District Centre Development
805832	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4169	In part	To aid the footfall in the town centre, the links to the Fish Quay should be highlighted and developed. The ferry landing should be moved to West Quay to engage more directly with the No. 1 Town Centre in S/6.3 Hierarchy of Centres	AS/6.5 North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre
806149	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	0	LPCD4303	Yes	The Beacon Centre was first built in 1978 with phase two opening some ten years later. It comprises of 42 retail units include Boots, Wilkinson's and New Look. The Beacon Centre has a multi-storey car park adjacent, with spaces for 423 cars. NRR is working with the Council to investigate the potential refurbishment of the Beacon Centre and improve the active frontages to the town centre. NRR is generally supportive of the policy text for AS/6.5 (North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre, as this is broadly in line with the ambitions to refurbish the shopping centre and improve the active frontages into the town centre.	AS/6.5 North Shields Town Centre: Beacon Centre
801716	BUSINESS	Unknown	LPCD2416	No	My main comment to this report is it is out of date, especially those parts that talk about the successful night time economy of Whitley Bay. As a retail business that is open to 10pm I can assure everyone that the night time economy of Whitley Bay is well and truly dead. As for the daytime economy I can only estimate that footfall and spend is down 25 to 30% over the last 3 years. My concern is that the Council are using these out of date reports as the foundations for the town's future development and we all know what happen if you build on dodgy foundations.	AS/6.6 Coastal Evening Economy: Whitley Bay and Tynemouth
806149	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	New River Retail	LPCD4302	In part	The Forum Shopping Centre was built in the 1960's and refurbished by Land Securities in 1996. It comprises a covered L-shaped mall of 45 retail units with external frontage onto The Forum area and High Street West. Totalling 91,000 sq ft of retail accommodation the centre contains a mixture of food, value and	AS/6.7 The Forum Shopping Centre,



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>multiple retailers benefiting from a 215 space decked car park. Planning permission was granted in October 2012 for the internal and external refurbishment of the shopping centre, change of use to provide new units (Class A1-A4), decked car parking and outline planning permission for the demolition of residential properties and the erection of a new Class A1 retail unit. A brand new state-of-the-art library and community centre is also being built. Work has already begun on delivering this major redevelopment proposal. In order for Wallsend to benefit from this expenditure, Policy DM/6.4 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 AS/6.7 (the Forum Shopping Centre, Wallsend) should clearly take precedence over more "generic" defined retail frontage policy. Policy 6.7 should also make reference to the role of non-food uses as an important part of the Centre's mix (and as recently permitted) now and in the future. The future redevelopment of parts of the Centre could significantly contribute towards the capacity identified in Policy S/6.2. As such Paragraph 6.17 should be amended as it underestimates the potential for Wallsend, and at present the first sentence does not make sense (particularly when read alongside Paragraph 6.56 which identifies some analysis already existing). It would not be appropriate to discuss the potential for out of centre sites (e.g. Paragraph 6.58) without fully understanding the potential future capacity for identified Centres.</p>	Wallsend
						6.8
396253	DEVELOPER	Northumberland Estates	LPCD2684		<p>The Northumberland Estates is strongly supportive of the Council's aspirations to expand Northumberland park District Centre. Para 6.47 of the Consultation Draft 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 Centre boundary. The Consultation Draft'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." However, it is noted that the District Centre boundary is drawn</p>	AS/6.9 Northumberland Park District Centre Retail Development

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>around the existing shopping centre on the Consultation Draft Proposals Map. In light of the sustainability, connectivity, and appropriate scale of the subject site to the south-west of Northumberland Park Metro Station, it is recommended that the site be specifically allocated for the expansion of Northumberland Park District Centre in forthcoming drafts of the Local Plan. Criterion b) of Policy AS/6.9 should be amended as a result, in order to make clear that the extension to the existing Centre will occupy the land to the south-west of Northumberland Park Metro (i.e. Site 30). The suggested approach would be in accordance with the NPPF, which also states at Para. 23 that, in drawing up Local Plans, local plan authorities should: “allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure [ect.] ... development needed in town centres. It is important that needs for ... main town centre uses are met in full and are not compromised by limited availability.” As set out in Section 2.0 above, the site to the south-west of Northumberland Park Metro Station is currently allocated for, inter alia, leisure development within the UDP. However it is noted that criterion a) of Policy AS/6.9 currently states that new development within the Centre will be permitted provided that “It can lead to an overall increase in comparison retail floorspace”. 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...” 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 further development and flexible use of land...” The site should therefore be allocated in accordance with NPPF to allow a range of appropriate town centre uses. In this context it should be noted that the development of a pub/restaurant has recently 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 businesses communities in the local area, it is recommended that Policy AS/6.9 be amended to identify the potential for both convenience and comparison floorspace on the site, in addition to a range of other town centre uses. Overall, therefore, The Northumberland Estates consider that, subject to the amendments set out below, Policy AS/6.9 represents a suitably flexible and aspirational policy to ensure the delivery of the</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					extension to Northumberland Park District Centre: “Proposals for new development(s) within the boundary of the Northumberland Park District Centre as identified on the Proposals Map will be permitted provided that they meet all of the following criteria: a. It can lead to an overall increase in comparison retail floorspace contribute to meeting the convenience and comparison retail, and 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 floorspace reflects its position as a district centre.”	
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6217		Whilst the Agency has no particular comment in relation to the policy, it is generally supportive of its provision within the plan. Paragraph 6.48 states that new retail developments within the area would provide opportunities to serve the new and increasing local community accommodated within the major residential schemes at Northumberland Park, Scaffold Hill and Shiremoor West. It then goes on to state that retention level for the borough as a whole would be improved through the reduction in leakage out to Newcastle or the Metro Centre. As such, with the addition of Part b., this should help to ensure the potential development is accessible from a range of sustainable methods of transport, but also help to maintain retail provision close to the local community, reducing congestion and the need to travel by private car.	AS/6.9 Northumberland Park District Centre Retail Development
807164	NATIONAL/REGIONAL ORGANISATION	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4889		The expansion of Northumberland Park District Centre Retail Park by some 4 hectares needs to consider how surface water will be managed as there is no suitable connection point within the public sewerage system to accept any surface water flows. Surface water from the existing Retail Park is disposed of via ground water infiltration.	AS/6.9 Northumberland Park District Centre Retail Development
807164	NATIONAL/REGIONAL ORGANISATION	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4894		NWL supports the prioritisation of the delivery of brownfield land as regeneration of these sites allows the opportunities to separate, minimise and control surface water which currently discharges into the public sewerage system in an uncontrolled manner. With appropriate policies which support surface water separation and minimisation, the responsibility to customers to ensure that investment in our capital programme is prioritised to ensure best value in all cases. This means that in order for the development aspirations of the North Tyneside Local Plan to be achieved we will require robust phasing	AS/6.9 Northumberland Park District Centre Retail Development

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					information for the development sites coming forward and clear implementation timescales to inform investment in future AMPS.	
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4654	0	Retail DM Policy 6.10 recognises that retail development may be appropriate outside the main retail areas and town centres. DM Policy 6.11 also recognises the need for local facilities. This is the case at Smith's Dock and was demonstrated as part of the outline planning permission determined in April 2013. By positively allocating the site and setting out an acceptable level of ancillary development a true mixed use development can be promoted and delivered on site.	DM/6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6220	0	The Agency is supportive of the sequential site assessment test the policy advocates through prioritising a town centre first approach. However, it does acknowledge that in some circumstances proposals may come forward for edge of centre or out of centre locations. Whilst the Agency generally supports the provisions of most of the policy, the reference in criteria to a. to out of centre locations readily accessible to key junctions of the A19(T) does present some concerns. It will therefore be important to consult the Agency at the earliest opportunity, in line with Circular 02/2013, regarding significant development proposals that may come forward in locations which could impact on any junction of the A19(T).	DM/6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development
805376	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Wet 'n' Wild Enterprises Limited in Administration c/o PwC	LPCD3571	0	Our client would support the criteria based approach detailed in Policy DM/6.10 to the assessment and control of proposals for edge of centre and out of centre retail development in the Borough. Our client would however object strongly to the omission of Royal Quays from the list of "out of centre" locations detailed in Paragraphs 6.58 + 6.59 that are considered by the Council as suitable locations for additional retail development. Royal Quays is undoubtedly a significant "hub" of retail activity and indeed is more sustainably located than most of the locations listed in Paragraph 6.58. Subject to the above, and the submission of a Retail Impact Assessment, we believe our client's site (Site 76 The former Wet 'n' Wild premises on Coble Dene Road) would satisfy all the relevant criteria listed in Policy DM/6.10 i.e. It is readily accessible to a Metro Station (Meadow Well or Percy Main stations) It is readily accessible to a junction of the A19 It is located adjacent to an existing out of centre retail location. Its development for retailing would be appropriate to the scale of the out of centre location Retail development of this scale in this location would not have a significant adverse impact individually	DM/6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					or cumulatively – The site is easily accessible and well connected to both Wallsend and North Shields town centres by both car and public transport. It is also accessible to nearby residential areas by foot and cycle. It is clear that in assessing our client’s site at Royal Quays, against each of the Criteria listed in Policy DM/6.10 that it would make a highly suitable location for additional retail development, especially, as highlighted in our representations in relation to Paragraph 6.20 of the plan, when there are no sequentially preferable sites in or on the edge of Wallsend or North Shields town centres.	
805724	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Horton Estate	LPCD4069	0	In the context of their proposals for a café / information centre on St Mary's headland Horton Estate wish to understand the implications of this policy and seek confirmation that the policy would not be applied to a bespoke development such as that envisaged.	DM/6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development
806134	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Cairnduff Developments (Longbenton) Ltd	LPCD4298	In part	Proposes allocation of former No Frills site at Whitley Road, Longbenton as a retail allocation. See attached letter for further comment.	DM/6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development
806149	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Ne River Retail	LPCD4314	In part	The Council has sought to identify suitable edge of centre and out of centre locations if no town centre sites are available, specifying the amount of potential floorspace for retail development. NRR does not consider it appropriate to set out the amount of floorspace available in these locations as it should be up to the applicant to demonstrate this requirement in a sequential and impact assessment. These figures (which are very specific and not clear whether gross or net) are likely to become out of date quickly during the Plan period. NRR consider it necessary to strengthen Policy DM/6.10 (Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development) by amending the policy (b) to specifically protect from impacts on planned growth in centres by development which comes forward on edge of centre and out of centre sites. This will reinforce the ‘town centre first’ approach advocated in the NPPF. The NPPF should be referenced in Paragraph 6.50 to emphasise this. Similarly, the first sentence of Policy DM/6.10 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] - this section of text should be deleted] [will not normally be permitted unless....] -this section of text should be added to the policy .....they meet the following criteria. NRR supports the Council’s decision to set the threshold for retail impact assessment’s at 500 sqm for comparison retail floorspace and 1,000	DM/6.10 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					sqm for convenience floorspace (both gross) and considers it to be appropriate given the out of town retail provision in the area.	
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4655	0	Retail DM Policy 6.10 recognises that retail development may be appropriate outside the main retail areas and town centres. DM Policy 6.11 also recognises the need for local facilities. This is the case at Smith's Dock and was demonstrated as part of the outline planning permission determined in April 2013. By positively allocating the site and setting out an acceptable level of ancillary development a true mixed use development can be promoted and delivered on site.	DM/6.11 Local Facilities
805724	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Horton Estate	LPCD4071	0	In the context of their proposals for a café / information centre on St Mary's headland, Horton Estate wish to understand the implications of this policy and seek confirmation that the policy would not be applied to a bespoke development such as that envisaged.	DM/6.11 Local Facilities
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6655	0	Policies S/7.1 'Strategic Housing', S/7.2 'Housing Figures' and S/7.3 'Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites'. The policy refers at a) to providing enough homes to meet current and future needs. This is fully supported by the Trust. However, this is in conflict with Policy S/7.2 and Objective 4 which do not aim to do this. Policy S/7.2 confirms the objectively assessed need for the area is 16,272 net additional homes until 2030. However, the Council are seeking to reduce this figure to between 10,500 and 12,000 net additional homes by working in partnership with Newcastle and Northumberland Councils who would provide land to meet any of the unmet housing need from North Tyneside. The Trust question whether there is any evidence to demonstrate an agreement is in place. The Trust's sites at Ash Court and Tynemouth Court can contribute to boosting housing supply and reiterate the sites should be allocated for housing.	7 Housing
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6695	0	Draft Policy S/7.1 sets out the strategic housing policies for housing delivery over the plan period and states that the Council will seek to ensure that an 'adequate range of sites' is made available across the Borough. In this respect it is noted that the Council does not allocate specific sites at this stage although, as part of these representations, it is considered fundamental to identify specific deliverable sites in order to be able to demonstrate the comprehensive	7 Housing

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					deliverability of the plan as part of the examination. It is also imperative that the plan qualifies within this policy what an 'adequate range of sites' relates to with regard to proposed housing numbers and the full, objectively assessed needs. Draft Policy S/7 .1 identifies a series of measures which the Council will take in order to achieve its housing objectives. This includes prioritising the delivery of brownfield land. This point is objected to by BPL on the grounds set out above in relation to draft Policy DM/2.2.	
805832	BUSINESS	Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4171	In part	The standards achieved by new housing and commercial development should aim to achieve zero carbon, and should at the minimum achieve EPC rating A. This standard should be repeated in all the sub-paragraphs of the specific development strategies. IF they do not a specific justification should be given as to why they can not. A community infrastructure levy should then be charged with specific upgrades to the local infrastructure of the development.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6623	In part	S/7.1 Strategic Housing: Notwithstanding the concerns over the proposed housing target, part 'a' of this policy is supported. However part 'c' reinforces the brownfield 'sequential' policy promoted in DM/2.2. As set out in the response to the earlier policy this is considered to represent a flawed and unsound approach to development on previously developed land which is not in accordance with the NPPF. On a separate note within part 'c', it should be made clear that the five year supply of deliverable housing should incorporate either a 5 / 20% buffer in line with the NPPF. It is suggested that the brownfield and housing land supply aspects of part 'c' are separated into different sections to provide clarity.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
808279	DEVELOPER	Bett Homes	LPCD5748	0	Draft Policy S/7.1 (Strategic Housing) sets out the strategic housing policies for housing delivery over the plan period and states that the Council seeks to ensure that an "adequate range of sites" is made available across the Borough. In respect of this policy it is imperative that the plan qualifies within the policy what an "adequate range of sites" relates to with regard to the proposed housing numbers and the full, objectively assessed needs.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6223	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the strategy proposed for strategic housing and in particular the requirement in Part b. to ensure that new housing is delivered sustainably and considers the requirements of supporting infrastructure. However, the Agency is not currently in a position to determine whether the network is fully capable of supporting the housing strategy or whether further improvements may be required to support the development	S/7.1 Strategic Housing

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					intentions for future housing, in addition to what has already been proposed in the Plan and supporting IDP. As has been previously stated, in accordance with DfT Circular 02/2013, where future strategic growth will have implications for the SRN, the Agency will require any capacity enhancements or infrastructure required to deliver this growth to be identified within the Local Plan. This should help to provide greater certainty and viability to the delivery of the Plans proposals and to the delivery of the infrastructure improvements required to support and deliver the strategy.	
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes (Newcastle )	LPCD6015	0	The policy as it stands is not in conformity with the NPPF: "Prioritising the delivery of brownfield 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". Para 111 of the NPPF encourages the re-use of brownfield land, but does not prioritise it. The Policy needs to be reworded to "encourage the delivery of brownfield land" rather than prioritise the use of brownfield land. This will ensure the policy is aligned with the requirement of the NPPF.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
474717	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Modrec Holdings Ltd	LPCD3452	Yes		0 S/7.1 Strategic Housing
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4608	0	Our Client broadly supports the strategy of ensuring that an adequate range of sites is made available across the Borough for housing development. In particular, our Client supports criteria a), which seeks to ensure that enough new homes are provided to meet both current and future needs. However Policy S/7 .1 is considered to be in conflict with Objective 4, which, in its current form without the amendments suggested above, does not aim to do this.	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD4908	0	Policy S/7.1- 'Strategic Housing' Our Client broadly supports the strategy of ensuring that an adequate range of sites is made available across the Borough for housing development. In particular, our Client supports criteria a), which seeks to ensure that enough new homes are provided to meet both current and future needs. However Policy S/7.1 is considered to be in conflict with Objective 4, which, in its current form without the amendments suggested above, does not aim to do this. Policy S/7 .1 c. seeks to prioritise the delivery of brownfield land. As set out above such an approach is not entirely consistent with the NPPF and instead reference should be made in Policy S/7.1 c. To "encouraging the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed".	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
808367	LANDOWNER /	0	LPCD5700	In part	The following paragraphs are set out our client's (Mr G Oliver) comments in	S/7.1 Strategic



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	BUSINESS				respect of draft policy S/7.1. Our client is broadly in support of this policy and the aims of ensuring an adequate range of development sites across the Borough. However (and in line with comments in response to DM/2.2) it is important that criterion c) does not require the 'prioritisation' of brownfield land. This is not a requirement of the NPPF (17) and if applied, more suitable and viable sites which are better located and not previously developed may be fettered. We request that an alternative wording to criterion c) be applied such as: c). Ensuring the effective delivery of previously developed land where suitable and available, whilst taking into consideration the viability of land for development and ensuring the Borough maintains a rolling five year supply of deliverable housing sites. This approach would be more flexible and would ensure that the policy would be more aligned to the provisions of the NPPF. Additionally the more flexible approach would result in the development of greenfield sites where they are better located within or adjacent to urban areas, benefit from good transport links and proximity to employment opportunities, and are more economically viable.	Housing
755686	NATIONAL ORGANISATION	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4597	In part	The HBF generally supports part 'a' of the policy which aims to provide enough new homes to meet current and future need. This does, however, appear to be in conflict with policy S/7.2 and objective 4 which do not aim to do this, see separate comments. Part 'c' of the policy aims to prioritise the use of brownfield land, as previously noted in comments upon Policy DM/2.2, this conflicts with the requirements of NPPF paragraph 111 which seeks to encourage the re-use of brownfield land rather than prioritise its use. The Councils recognition that viability will be a consideration in such prioritisation is welcomed but it is recommended that the policy be amended to read 'Encouraging the delivery of brownfield land'. This change will not only make the plan more compliant with the NPPF but will assist the Council in ensuring that the housing development required is brought forward at the required rate. Part 'j' of the policy is supported, but it is not considered a necessary inclusion. This is because the Council is required by NPPF paragraph 47 to retain a choice of sites which make up the five year housing supply, failure to retain such a supply would render the housing policies out of date (NPPF paragraph 48).	S/7.1 Strategic Housing
396324	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Newcastle Airport	LPCD3052	0	In developing new housing, there needs to be a balanced approach to identifying appropriate new sites alongside the continued operation of a major	7 New Housing

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>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 examining the likely impacts of the Airport on proposed future residential housing locations, Planning Policy Guidance Note 24; Planning and Noise, (PPG24) offers guidance. While the introduction of the new draft National Planning Policy Framework has replaced this document as formal guidance, given the significant noise analysis behind it, we consider that the content of PPG 24 still carries weight. PPG 24, through the planning system, advised on “minimising the adverse impacts of noise without placing unreasonable restrictions on development or adding unduly to the costs and administrative burdens of business.” For significant developments such as airports, it provided a framework to produce noise contours for certain types of development. This was then considered in conjunction with Noise Exposure Categories which advised Local Planning Authorities on the most (or least) appropriate locations for development. Airports are required to continue to produce noise contours and therefore we consider that the Noise Exposure Categories within PPG 24, along with the Airports noise contours, should be transposed into this local plan, within the development management section. We would be happy to work with officers of the Council on this should this be required. While none of the sites proposed would be considered to be within a potentially noise sensitive location, based on our most recent modelled contours, the contours should still be transposed into the document in order to capture any potential windfall housing sites.</p>	
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6696	0	<p>Paragraphs 7.6 and 7.7 of the draft plan provide an accurate summary of the importance of identifying the correct housing requirement over the plan period and recognise the relationship between housing delivery and economic growth. In this respect it is imperative that the Council identifies the correct housing target within the plan in order to achieve its overall aims and objectives. It is noted within draft Policy S/7.2 that the Council's objectively assessed housing requirement for the emerging plan period is some 16,272 net additional homes. It is noted that this figure is based upon the 2011 interim household projections although the figure is not significantly different from the most up-to-date full 2008 based household projections (a difference of some 261 no. units over the</p>	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>full plan period), or the 2013 projections of 16,630 net additions (a difference of some 358 no. units over the full plan period). In considering the appropriate housing target for the Borough over the plan period, the Council must consider the overarching message of the Framework in relation to housing delivery which is to 'boost significantly the supply of housing'. This is bolstered by the requirement for authorities to meet their full, objectively assessed needs for housing delivery over the plan period. Overall, it is considered that the Council must reconsider its housing requirements over the forthcoming plan period before the next round of consultation in order to ensure it has a sound evidence base. In terms of this consultation document, it is considered that the Council's proposals to reduce the housing target to between 10,500 and 12,000 net additions over the plan period is unsound. The emerging policy states that 'working in partnership with our neighbours in Newcastle upon Tyne and Northumberland on overall housing delivery it is currently anticipated this requirement could be reduced'. However, no evidence is set out within the draft plan to substantiate this position and, indeed, this position does not appear to be reflected in either the Newcastle Gateshead Joint Core Strategy which is due to be submitted for Examination in early 2014 or the emerging Northumberland County Council Local Plan. In this respect it is considered that the Council cannot demonstrate that its emerging Local Plan will meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing and fails the requirements of paragraph 47 of the Framework. This situation conflicts with each of the tests of soundness listed above. In the event that adjoining authorities were able to accommodate an element of the Council's housing requirement over the forthcoming plan period, it is considered that such a significant proportion of that housing requirement would adversely affect the ability of the Council to achieve its economic aims and objectives over the plan period. In this respect it is noted that the proposed figures of between 10,500 and 12,000 net additions over the plan period represent reductions of between 26% and 35% of the objectively assessed requirement based on the 2011 interim projections). Such a significant reduction in housing delivery is not considered to be consistent with the objectives of the Framework and will not 'boost significantly the supply of housing'. A further concern relating to the significant reduction in housing targets over the plan period relates to housing affordability within the Borough. It is noted within the Council's most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHM_A) that there is an identified annual requirement for some</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>479 affordable homes over the next 10 years. It is a basic principle that housing affordability is directly related to supply and demand and where supply is artificially constrained house prices will rise further, placing further pressures on housing affordability. With regard to the affordable housing shortfall itself, the Beta version of the National Planning Policy Guidance is clear that any shortfall should be addressed over the first 5 year period, and not 10 years as proposed here. The overall conclusion is, therefore, that the emerging plan is not sound and a fundamental reconsideration of the Council's housing targets must be progressed before further consultation takes place.</p>	
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4653	0	<p>Housing Figures PfP and Fairhurst note that Policy S/7.2 "Housing Figures" of the Consultation Draft Local Plan states that North Tyneside's objectively assessed requirement for net housing delivery between 2013 and 2030 is estimated at 16,272 net additional homes but that, working in partnership with Newcastle City Council and Northumberland County Council, the anticipated requirement could be reduced to 10,500 and 12,000 net additional homes over the period 2013 to 2030. Based on the supporting text of the Local Plan, PfP and Fairhurst assume these figures do not include Smith's Dock. However, clarification would be welcomed by PfP and Fairhurst in relation to this matter. PfP and Fairhurst are obviously keen for a sound, up to date Local Plan to be progressed and adopted to provide an appropriate development framework in North Tyneside. PfP and Fairhurst have reviewed the evidence base of the Consultation Draft Local Plan and would raise concerns regarding the level of demonstration that has been provided that the Newcastle and Northumberland administrative areas can accommodate between 4,272 and 5,772 of North Tyneside's objectively assessed requirement. Fairhurst are fully aware that both Newcastle and Northumberland are progressing emerging Local Plans which aim to provide sufficient housing to retain and attract working age families but nothing is confirmed to date. In the absence of detailed justification as to how this will be delivered, PfP and Fairhurst are concerned that housing requirements will not be met. PfP and Fairhurst are aware of the Memorandum of Understanding which exists between the Tyne and Wear local authorities. However, PfP and Fairhurst consider that significant additional evidence will need to be presented by NTC to meet requirements of the Duty to Co-operate within Tyne and Wear and Northumberland. At present, it is very difficult to effectively comment on the spatial distribution of housing numbers set out in Policy S/7.3 "Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites" as the</p>	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					published evidence base of the overall housing figures is not sound.	
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6624	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	<p>S/7.2 Housing Figures: There are considered to be a number of issues arising from the housing figures contained within the NTLP which have been outlined below and sub-divided into appropriate sections. The following needs to be read in the context of the duty to co-operate section earlier in these representations which is of critical importance to the proposed approach on housing numbers and must be addressed prior to the next stage of the plan. Evidence base “ Paragraph 7.12 outlines how the housing figures contained within this section are based on 2011 interim household projections. This is considered to be an inappropriate data set upon which to base housing figures within the NTLP. The 2011 projections are interim and cover the period between 2011 and 2021 “ i.e. not the whole of the plan period up to 2030. Furthermore they reflect a recessionary period through which housebuilding and household growth was constrained through short-term issues including an economic downturn, a low supply of market housing and restricted mortgage availability. As such projecting these figures forward is likely to under-represent actual need across the plan period as they contain a number of concealed households which were unable to fully form under the above conditions. This viewpoint has been supported by Inspectors at Examination of both the Lichfield and South Worcestershire plans. If the 2011 projections are to be used they must be utilised with caution to ensure that they do not reflect a period of economic downturn in the proposed housing numbers throughout the plan period. The most up to date full dataset available consists of the 2008 household projections, which is used in the “What Homes Where” online database. This is an independent tool which projects a policy-neutral population and household change for an area based on the most recent CLG statistics. It is a tool which has been advocated by Inspectors at Examination and it is suggested that it should form the basis of the NTLP housing figures. From this point the economic growth aspirations of the plan should be incorporated as well as relevant data from an up to date SHMA. In addition to the above, the proposed housing figures should be re-assessed upon completion of the SHMA update being undertaken. Economic Vision “ Chapter 5 of the NTLPCD establishes the economic growth strategy for the borough. Whilst no job creation figures are provided it is clear that the NTLP seeks to provide a platform for economic growth, with S/5.1 providing a spatial element for growth areas such as the A19 corridor and River Tyne North Bank Area. The housing figures contained within</p>	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>the plan must incorporate this economic growth strategy and positively plan for it – in other words economic growth needs to be accompanied by additional housing numbers. It is unclear whether this has been factored into the figures proposed in S/7.2 and this is an issue which should be addressed in the next iteration of the NTLP. Future housing figures must demonstrate that they have taken the following into account: – A housing growth figure based on appropriate and up-to-date population projections; – The proposed level of economic growth aspired to within the plan and the necessary increase in housing numbers required to facilitate this; – Firm evidence of undertaking and agreements with neighbouring authorities as to how crossboundary working will be established, maintained and monitored over the plan period. This is particularly relevant where an LPA’s objectively assessed housing needs are to be met in part by a separate Authority.</p>	
808279	DEVELOPER	Bett Homes	LPCD5749	<p align="center">Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 7.6 and 7.7 of the draft plan provide an accurate summary of the importance of identifying the correct housing requirement over the plan period and recognises the relationship between housing delivery and economic growth. In this respect it is imperative that the Council identifies the correct housing target within the plan in order to achieve its overall aims and objectives. It is noted within draft policy S/7.2 that the Council's objectively assessed housing requirement for the emerging plan period is some 16,272 net additional homes. It is noted that this figure is based upon the 2011 interim household projections although the figure is not significantly different from the most up-to-date full 2008 based household projections ( a difference of some 261 no. units over the full plan period), or the 2013 projections of 16,630 net additions (a difference of some 358 no. units over the full plan period.) In considering the appropriate housing target for the Borough over the plan period, the Council must consider the overarching message of the Framework in relation to housing delivery which is to "boost significantly the supply of housing". This is bolstered by the requirement for authorities to meet their full, objectively assessed needs for housing delivery over the plan period. Overall, it is considered that the Council must reconsider its housing requirements over the forthcoming plan period before the next round of consultation in order to ensure it has a sound evidence base. In terms of this consultation document, it is considered that the Council's proposals to reduce the housing target tot between 10,500 and 12,000 net additions over the plan period is unsound. The emerging policy states that "working in partnership with our neighbours in Newcastle upon Tyne and</p>	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>Northumberland on overall housing delivery it is currently anticipated this requirement could be reduced". However, no evidence is set out within the draft plan to substantiate this position and, indeed, this position does not appear to be reflected in either the Newcastle Gateshead Core Strategy which is due to be submitted for Examination in early 2014 or the emerging Northumberland County Council Local Plan. In this respect it is considered that the Council cannot demonstrate that its emerging Local Plan will meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing and fails the requirements of paragraph 47 of the Framework. This situation conflicts with each of the tests of soundness listed above. In the event that adjoining authorities were able to accommodate an element of the Council's housing requirement over the forthcoming plan period, it is considered that such a significant proportion of that housing requirement would adversely affect the ability of the Council to achieve its economic aims and objectives over the plan period. In this respect it is noted that the proposed figures of between 10,00 and 12,000 net additions over the plan period represent reductions of between 26% and 35% of the objectively assessed requirement based on the 2011 interim projections. Such a significant reduction in housing delivery is not considered to be consistent with the objectives of the Framework and will not "boost significantly the supply of housing". A further concern relating to the significant reduction in housing targets over the plan period relates to housing affordability within the Borough. It is noted within the Council's most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that there is an identified annual requirement for some 479 affordable homes over the next 10 years. It is a basic principle that housing affordability is directly related to supply and demand and where supply is artificially constrained house prices will rise further, placing further pressures on housing affordability. With regard to the affordable housing shortfall itself, the Beta version of the National Planning Policy Guidance is clear that any shortfall should be addressed over the first 5 year period, and not 10 years as proposed here. The overall conclusion is, therefore, that the emerging plan is not sound and a fundamental reconsideration of the Council's housing targets must be progressed before further consultation takes place.</p>	
768554	GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION	Highways Agency	LPCD6226	0	<p>As stated above, the Agency is not currently in a position to determine whether the network is fully capable of supporting the housing strategy or whether further improvements may be required to support the development intentions for future housing, in addition to what has already been proposed in the Plan</p>	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>and supporting IDP. Once the quantum and distribution of future housing development has been finalised, the Agency will be able to determine what the implications are for the network and whether any additional improvements will be required. As has been previously stated, in accordance with DfT Circular 02/2013, where future strategic growth will have implications for the SRN, the Agency will require any capacity enhancements or infrastructure required to deliver this growth to be identified within the Local Plan. This should help to provide greater certainty and viability to the delivery of the Plans proposals and to the delivery of the infrastructure improvements required to support and deliver the strategy.</p>	
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes (Newcastle )	LPCD6018	0	<p>The Plan identifies the objectively assessed need for the area is 16,272 net additional homes until 2030. The Council argues that by working with Newcastle and Northumberland, the need can be reduced to between 10,500 – 12,000 net additional homes. Based on a reduced housing figure the Council has set out an annual requirement of 618-749. Although such an annual requirement only equals 11,900 net additional homes as a maximum. We are keen for the Council to clarify whether an official agreement to work together has been received from neighbouring authorities. BDW has seen no evidence that Newcastle and Northumberland will deliver North Tyneside’s additional housing need. In order for the Plan to be found sound, the Council must either plan to deal with the objectively assessed housing need itself or receive formal agreement from neighbouring authorities that they will pick up additional housing need. Both Kirkless and Hart Local Plans failed their examination on failure to meet their own objectively assessed housing need. Provision of 16,272 net dwellings 2013-2030 equals approximately 957 net additional dwellings per annum. We are supportive of this figure which is higher than the RSS target of 460 dwellings per annum. However, we are concerned that 957 dwellings per annum to deliver 16,272 net dwellings by 2030 is only deliverable over 17 years, 2013-2030. In reality the Plan period will not start until 2015 and unless extended beyond 2030, delivery of 16,272 dwellings over only 15 years will require a delivering of 1,085 houses per annum. We would urge the Council, in light of the revocation of the RSS and introduction of NPPF, to identify their own objectively assessed housing need. The Council must set out clearly their net additional housing requirement; the Plan is currently very inconsistent: Policy S/7.2 sets a net housing delivery between 2013 and 2030 at 16,272, whilst Policy S/7.1 provides for 10,500 – 12,000 net additional homes to 2029/30. The gross housing</p>	S/7.2 Housing Figures



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>target calculation also raises some concerns. The Council has suggested that based on an overall target of 10,500-12,000 net additional homes, the outstanding gross housing target over the Plan period is 8,159 – 9,659 homes. This outstanding figure is high but has accounted for 3,701 homes being delivered as a result of existing permission or sites minded to be granted permission by the Council. We do not believe it is appropriate for the Council to consider all existing permissions/applications minded to grant will be brought forward – therefore the outstanding target will be much greater and even greater based on the boroughs actual housing requirement of 16,272 homes. BDW can guarantee that they will be bringing forward their sites at Scaffold Hill and Norgas House, as mentioned in the Plan. The Council needs to carefully calculate its target for the Plan period based on the objectively assessed need of the borough; consider whether it is realistic to think 3,701 dwellings will come forward as existing permissions or permissions minded to grant; and whether they have identified sufficient sites and adequately planned for an outstanding gross housing target of 13,931 dwellings. We would also urge the Council to look at Table 2: Gross Housing Targets 2013/14 to 2029/30, p73 of the Plan. There appear to be a number of typing errors in the table, specifically related to the letters allocated to each section. We would also like to see a 20% buffer added to the housing target to ensure choice and competition in the market for land, moved forward from later in the Plan. 10. Household Projections The need in North Tyneside is based on household projections which extend to 2021, projected forward from 2011 figures until 2030. Basing household needs on 2011 interim projections raises some concerns, as the figures will be reflective of the recessionary period and likely to under-represent actual need due to significant number of concealed households. We would advise the Council to use these figures with care. Problems with using 2011 interim projections to determine household need were identified at the Lichfield and South Worcestershire examination. The Inspector at Lichfield concluded – over the longer term household representation rates have been rising and the fall in these rates identified in the 2011 projection is likely to have been driven by short term factors such as the impact of the recession, constraints on housing supply and constraints on mortgage lending. It is reasonable, therefore, to assume that beyond 2021 (the end of the period covered by 2011 projections) household representation rates will resume their long term rise –™. The Council must base the need on the most up to date projections possible to ensure</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					requirement for housing over the Plan period is representative. The updated SHMA will be a key piece of evidence base.	
639692	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	W.B. Kerr Luxury Coaches Ltd	LPCD273	Plan to meet national population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	none given	S/7.2 Housing Figures
396325	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4392	0	NWL acknowledges that work is ongoing to establish the overall level of housing delivery that will be required within North Tyneside and reserves the right to provide further representations with regards to Policy S/7.2 once the evidence base has been updated. As currently drafted, NWL note that Policy S/7.2 confirms the objectively assessed need for the area is 16,272 net additional homes until 2030, however, the Council are seeking to reduce this figure to between 10,500 and 12,000 net additional homes by working in partnership with Newcastle and Northumberland Councils, who would provide land to meet any of the unmet housing need within North Tyneside. NWL question whether there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate such an agreement is in place to ensure that there will not be a shortfall in housing provision. In addition it is noted that the phasing of the delivery of housing is stepped- in part due to the present state of the economy. In this context it is recommended that the Council seek to address any delivery issues as early as possible through, in part, the allocation of small sites capable of contributing to the Council's five year supply, such as Moorhouses Reservoir. As such, NWL request that Moorhouses Reservoir be allocated for residential development, in light of its potential to contribute to the Borough's five year housing land supply.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4610	0	Our Client acknowledges that work is ongoing to establish the overall level of housing delivery that will be required within North Tyneside and reserves the right to provide further representations with regards to Policy S/7.2 once the evidence base has been updated. As currently drafted, our Client notes that Policy S/7.2 confirms the objectively assessed need for the area is 16,272 net additional homes until 2030, however, the Council are seeking to reduce this	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					figure to between 10,500 and 12,000 net additional homes by working in partnership with Newcastle and Northumberland Councils, who would provide land to meet the housing need that is not delivered in North Tyneside. At this stage no evidence of such an agreement has been provided in accordance to the 'Duty to Co-operate' set out in the NPPF. Further information is therefore required to ensure that objectively assessed needs will be met in a sustainable manner. In addition it is noted that the phasing of the delivery of housing is stepped- in part due to the present state of the economy. In this context it is recommended that the Council seek to address any delivery issues as early as possible through, in part, the allocation of small sites capable of contributing to the Council's five year supply, such as the former St. Gobain site. As such, our Client requests that the former St. Gobain site be allocated for residential development, in light of its potential to contribute to the Borough's five year housing land supply.	
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD4914	0	Policy S/7.2- 'Housing Figures' Our Client acknowledges that work is ongoing to establish the overall level of housing delivery that will be required within North Tyneside and reserves the right to provide further representations with regards to Policy S/7.2 once the evidence base has been updated. As currently drafted, our Client note that Policy S/7.2 confirms the objectively assessed need for the area is 16,272 net additional homes until 2030, however, the Council are seeking to reduce this figure to between 10,500 and 12,000 net additional homes by working in partnership with Newcastle and Northumberland Councils, who would provide land to meet any of the unmet housing need within North Tyneside. Our Client questions whether there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate such an agreement is in place to ensure that there will not be a shortfall in housing provision. In addition it is noted that the phasing of the delivery of housing is stepped- in part due to the present state of the economy. In this context it is recommended that the Council seek to address any delivery issues as early as possible through, in part, the allocation of small sites capable of contributing to the Council's five year supply, such as our Client's site. As such, our Client requests that the site to the west of Russell Square be allocated for residential development, in light of its potential to contribute to the Borough's five year housing land supply.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
808367	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Mr Oliver	LPCD5701	Plan to meet national	The following paragraphs set out our client's (Mr G Oliver) response to policy S/7.2 Housing Figures. Policy S/7.2 advocates a situation in which through cross boundary working with Newcastle and Northumberland, housing delivery within	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
				population projections, about 16,200 additional homes.	<p>the North Tyneside area could be reduced to between 10,500 - 12,000 homes from the new housing delivery requirement of 16,272 homes. We object to this proposal and consider that North Tyneside should plan to accommodate the requirements for housing growth within the Borough. We have studied the evidence base behind the Consultation Document, including the SHMA and the SHLAA. Sufficient land exists within North Tyneside to accommodate the requirements for 16,272 net additional homes and thus the need for providing between 4,272 - 5,772 homes outwith the Borough seems unjustifiable. Para 7.22 makes it clear that only a proportion of the sites identified at this stage will be allocated for development in order to meet the preferred growth target and consequently it is evident that if more of the available sites are allocated, the Borough could deliver the required net housing growth levels of 16,272 without looking outside the Borough. If North Tyneside Council is relying on the delivery of 4,272 - 5,772 houses within Northumberland and Newcastle, for which no allowance seems to have been made or agreed by either authority, the North Tyneside plan is unlikely to pass the tests of soundness in that it will not have been 'positively prepared' or be 'justified'. We also strongly question the ability of Newcastle and Northumberland to provide this level of housing and any firm agreement from them to do so. It is accepted that a Memorandum of Understanding between the Council's exists as the appropriate mechanism in order to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. However, Northumberland's recent Consultation Document (October 2013) does not contain any indication within its housing policies as to whether any provision is being made to accommodate additional housing through cross boundary working with North Tyneside. The same is true for Newcastle as no detail is provided with regard to the provisions of housing requirements from North Tyneside. Additionally, no workings or specifics of additional allocations in the local authority areas of Newcastle or Northumberland have been provided by North Tyneside and consequently our client has serious concerns as to the apparent deficit of between 4,272 - 5,772 net additional dwellings, particularly when there is ample land within the Borough to ensure that the requirement of 16,272 additional dwellings is met. It is stated within para 7.17 that 'the emerging Local Plans of both Newcastle and Northumberland are to provide sufficient housing to retain and attract working age families to help support and maintain sustainable communities in these locations. If successful this would reduce historic patterns of migration from Newcastle to North Tyneside and support the stable level of</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>growth set out in Policy S/7.1'. It is our strong opinion that the reduced housing figure preferred by North Tyneside cannot be based on an assumption that housing delivery in Newcastle and Northumberland may reduce the need for housing in North Tyneside. It should also be noted that the figures within the table do not tally. The levels of housing delivery preferred by North Tyneside amount to between 10,500 and 12,000. However, the total delivery figures for 2029/2030 have been stated as 10,506 to 11,900 net additional homes. This seems to include demolitions but is not clarified until para 7.20/Table 2.</p>	
396306	LOCAL AUTHORITY	South Tyneside Council,	LPCD2495	0	<p>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 neighbouring authorities where reasonable and appropriate, we would be grateful if you could confirm to what extent North Tyneside Council has identified sufficient land to provide for its own proposed strategic housing growth requirements in particular? Hence, as a result of the suggestion that Newcastle and Northumberland will help to provide for some of your objectively assessed needs, 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 will inevitably be 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.</p>	S/7.2 Housing Figures
755686	NATIONAL ORGANISATION	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4599	0	<p>The policy notes that the Council's objectively assessed need for the area is 16,272 net additional homes until 2030, however it is noted that the Council is working in partnership with Newcastle upon Tyne and Northumberland in an attempt to reduce the figure to between 10,500 and 12,000 net additional homes. The HBF is, however, unaware of any official agreements between the authorities that they would be willing to take any of the unmet housing need from North Tyneside. Under the duty to co-operate the Council would have to show evidence of any such agreement. Indeed Newcastle upon Tyne, alongside Gateshead, are relatively advanced in the plan making process, having recently consulted upon the submission version of their joint plan. It is noted that neither</p>	S/7.2 Housing Figures

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>the submission version of the plan nor the evidence provided to comply with the duty to co-operate identify they would be willing, or indeed able, to accommodate any unmet housing need from North Tyneside. Given the lack of evidence currently available it is recommended that North Tyneside aim to deal with its own objectively assessed housing need as failure to do so without agreement from others will lead to the plan being found unsound. The recent examinations of Kirklees and Hart are examples of authorities who have failed over this issue. The suggested objectively assessed requirement of 16,272 net dwellings 2013 to 2030 equates to approximately 957 net additional dwellings per annum. This figure is greater than the now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) target of 460 and in this regard the HBF is supportive of the Council in recognising its overall housing requirement. The revocation of the RSS and the introduction of the NPPF do, however, require local authorities to identify their own objectively assessed housing need. The evidence upon which this should be based is indicated both within the draft NPPG as well as the PAS publication "Ten key principles for owning your housing number (July 2013)" and includes household projections, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), neighbouring authorities and the economic ambitions of the authority. Each of these issues are considered below; Household Projections It is noted that the Councils suggested objectively assessed requirement of 16,272 net new dwellings 2013 to 2030 is based upon the 2011 interim household projections which only extend to 2021. The Council has projected forward the 2011 figures until 2030. The Council are advised to use the 2011 interim projections with care as they are by their very nature only interim and do not represent the full plan period. They are also reflective of a recessionary period and are therefore likely to under-represent actual need due to a significant number of concealed households. The recent examinations at Lichfield and South Worcestershire indicate the problems with the use of the 2011 interim projections with the inspector at Lichfield noting; "over the longer term household representation rates have been rising and the fall in these rates identified in the 2011 projection is likely to have been driven by short term factors such as the impact of the recession, constraints on housing supply and constraints on mortgage lending. It is reasonable, therefore, to assume that beyond 2021 (the end of the period covered by the 2011 projection) household representation rates will resume their long term rise" (Inspectors initial concerns, paragraph 24). The most up to date full dataset is based upon the 2008 household projections included in</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>the “What homes where” toolkit, an independent and free to use resource presenting Government population and household projections. This data identifies a slightly higher requirement of 16,533 over the whole plan period, equating to 973 net new dwellings per annum for North Tyneside. Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Whilst the use of household projections provide a useful starting point in determining a housing requirement they do not identify the whole picture. The government places significant emphasis upon the SHMA in identifying; “the scale (our emphasis) and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period” (NPPF paragraph 159). The most up to date North Tyneside SHMA was completed in 2009 with a key elements update completed in 2011. The Council correctly acknowledge that to ensure the plan is based upon an up to date evidence base at examination a complete refresh of the SHMA is required. This work was commenced earlier in 2013 and the outcomes are awaited. The current 2011 update to the SHMA identified an annual shortfall of 908 net dwellings per annum. This is broken down into a need for 479 affordable homes and 429 market homes. If these figures are replicated in the refreshed SHMA this would indicate the need for a housing requirement in excess of 908 dwellings, to meet the affordable housing need which could not be viably delivered with only 429 market homes. The Council indicate, by way of example, in the background paper “Housing and Population” this would require an annual requirement of 1,900 homes per annum, based upon a 25% affordable housing contribution. Whilst it is recognised this figure is for illustrative purposes only it does point towards the need for a higher overall housing requirement within North Tyneside, than the suggested need of 957 and way above the discounted requirement of between 618 (10,500 plan requirement) and 706 (12,000 plan requirement) dwellings per annum. Neighbouring authorities Given that North Tyneside is hopeful it can reduce its overall housing requirement based upon co-operation with neighbouring authorities it is worth considering the housing requirements, either adopted or emerging of these areas. North Tyneside is bordered by Northumberland, Newcastle upon Tyne and South Tyneside. Due to the variable timescales involved in the differing plans and the limitations of the 2011 based interim figures the “What households Where” data has been used to compare the requirements against the 2008 based household forecasts for each plan period. Local Authority Plan Period Annual housing target (net) What households where annual target</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>Difference per year Northumberland 2011-2031 1,216 1,015 +201 Newcastle 2010-2030 850 1,046 -196 South Tyneside (adopted 2007) 2004-2021 325* 556* -231 Annual Under-Delivery Total -226 *South Tyneside Core Strategy only allocated for period 2011 to 2021. The table above illustrates that when considered against the 2008 household projections there is a net under-delivery amongst neighbouring authorities of 226 dwellings per annum. The issue of under-delivery from neighbouring authorities was identified as a reason for concern over the soundness of the Inspector of the Mid-Sussex local plan (Inspectors final conclusions on the duty to co-operate 2nd December 2013). Given this under-provision it is questionable whether the Council should be seeking to reduce its own housing requirement. Economic aspirations Whilst the plan does not quantify the number of jobs sought across the plan period it is clear that the plan is aiming to create additional jobs within North Tyneside. However to fill these jobs may require the continuation of current migration patterns into the district. This is because, as evidenced by the Council’s document “Evidence Base: How are we doing in North Tyneside” published in April 2013, the proportion of the population aged 65 and over is increasing and is likely to increase by 56% between 2010 and 2035. This is above the regional average. Therefore unless the Council continues to attract significant numbers of younger working age migrants into the area it is unlikely to achieve its economic ambitions. The likely consequences of which will be either a decline in the economic prosperity of the area, or if the jobs are created additional commuting into the area. The HBF contend that neither of the above scenarios are desirable. The three modelled scenarios included in the background paper do not appear to consider the issue of the aging population structure or the effect reduced rates of migration may have upon the economic prosperity of the area. They simply seek to reduce migration rates into the area without analysis of the consequences. Such an approach does not provide a robust evidence base upon which to make decisions upon an objectively assessed housing need for North Tyneside. Recommendation It is recommended that prior to the next phase of consultation the Council provides adequate evidence that neighbouring authorities are willing, and able, to accommodate any unmet housing needs arising from North Tyneside. If such agreements cannot be made it is recommended that the Council seeks to meet its own housing needs. The housing need should be based not only upon the projections but also on an up to date SHMA and an understanding of the economic implications of the</p>	



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					differing housing requirements.	
807052	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Newcastle Green Party	LPCD4738	Seek another option for meeting the borough's evidence-based requirements for housing growth.	The North Tyneside development plans does not constitute proper planning since it fail to plan for the social, economic and environmental challenges most likely to lie ahead. Instead it is based on projections that are a mixture of wishful thinking and the unwarranted assumption that past trends can simply be projected into the future in a linear fashion. Worse they will leave local communities less resilient in the face of developments such as adverse climate change and coming peaks in cheap oil and other resource production. 3. The plan threatens a huge increase in urban sprawl in what would be an unsustainable building bubble. It will swamp several local communities, degrading their physical and social identity and qualities. Such sprawl would lead to a big increase in travel journeys and therefore more congestion and worse air pollution. Decaying areas closer to the river would continue to go downhill because of the plan's bias to development on green open spaces. The plan would lead to the house construction programmes that will be heavily weighed toward the top end of the market and will do so at the expense of those most in need. There is a quite unsustainable neglect of the needs of the fastest growing section of the local community, those over 65. There are already signs that current housing sales are another short-term speculative property boom. The council should not be feeding it.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	CPRE North East	LPCD6535	Work with our neighbours to meet our shared requirements for household growth, about 10,500 to 12,000 additional homes.	We welcome the Council's strong commitment to a "brownfield first" policy (c) and to affordable housing (d). We applaud the Council's decision not to join in the "Dutch auction" being engaged in by neighbouring authorities over population and housing growth predictions, which is likely to result in unrealistic population and housing need projections and in consequence, excessive housing provision, including unnecessary invasions of the Green Belt. We also welcome the collaboration with Newcastle City Council that has resulted in the overall housing requirement being reduced from over 16,000 to 12,000. However, we would again here urge the Council to consider whether it has areas where planning permission has already been given for development but no construction has yet taken place: The present tendency for developers to engage in "land banking" should cause the Council to give priority to the development of such sites before granting permissions in "Greenfield" sites or (even more) sites in the Green Belt.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
807008	OTHER / LOCAL	Northumbria	LPCD4713	0	We believe the national and local population projections requiring 16,200 new	S/7.2 Housing

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	ORGANISATION	rland and Newcastle Society			homes for North Tyneside are out of date and have been greatly exaggerated to the benefit of the major housebuilders.	Figures
804025	BUSINESS/LANDOWNER	Mr Watson	LPCD2628	0	Fairhurst note that Policy S/7.2 "Housing Figures" of the Consultation Draft Local Plan states that North Tyneside's objectively assessed requirement for net housing delivery between 2013 and 2030 is estimated at 16,272 net additional homes but that, working in partnership with Newcastle City Council and Northumberland County Council, the anticipated requirement could be reduced to between 10,500 and 12,000 net additional homes over the period 2013 to 2030. Fairhurst have reviewed the evidence base of the Consultation Draft Local Plan and would raise significant concerns regarding the level of demonstration that has been provided that the Newcastle and Northumberland administrative areas can accommodate between 4272 and 5772 of North Tyneside's objectively assessed requirement. Fairhurst are fully aware that both Newcastle and Northumberland are progressing emerging Local Plans which aim to provide sufficient housing to retain and attract working age families. The principle of taking a strategic, cross boundary approach to stemming out mitigation from Newcastle to North Tyneside is accepted. However, in the absence of detailed justification as to how this will be delivered, Fairhurst are concerned that strategic housing requirements will not be met. Fairhurst are aware of the Memorandum of Understanding which exists between the Tyne and Wear local authorities. However, Fairhurst consider that significant additional evidence will need to be presented by NTC to meet the requirements of the Duty to Co-operate. At present, it is very difficult to effectively comment on the spatial distribution of housing numbers as set out in Policy S/7.3 "Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites" as the published evidence base of the overall housing figures is not sound.	S/7.2 Housing Figures
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6697	No	Draft Policy S/7 .3 identifies the broad locations for development over the plan period. The plan does not identify site specific allocations and as such the emerging plan is not capable of demonstrating the deliverability of the housing distribution set out within the draft policy. Irrespective of the identification of specific sites, it is also considered that the total unit numbers set out within draft Policy S/7 .3 do not meet the objectively assessed needs for housing over the plan period as discussed above in relation to draft Policy S/7.2. Draft Policy S/7 .3 allocates over 80% of the total unit numbers to the 'main urban area'. It	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>has already been established through the Council's evidence set out within its affordable housing viability assessment that viability is the greatest constraint to development within the urban area and such reliance upon the urban area as part of the emerging plan provides further doubts over the Council's ability to deliver the objectives of the emerging plan. In accordance with the representations made above, it is submitted the Council must consider allocation of areas of safeguarded land to deliver its housing requirements over the forthcoming plan period in order to ensure the plan is found sound as part of the examination. It is considered that comprehensive development of large greenfield sites are more likely to possess a critical mass capable of being able to deliver a wider range of planning benefits than a series of smaller sites within the urban area which have viability constraints. Furthermore, the text within draft Policy S/7.3 alleges the capacity of sites identified within the policy would 'exceed the Borough's objectively assessed housing requirement'. On the basis that the Council's objectively assessed requirement is likely to be around 16,272 to 16,630 net additions over the plan period based upon the evidence considered by the Council to date, it is clear that, even with existing permissions, the identified sites fall significantly short of the objectively assessed requirement.</p>	
396220	COUNCILLOR	North Tyneside Council	LPCD5988		<p>The Draft Plan is unbalanced and does not fairly distribute the sites for potential development across the Borough. The proposals should be reviewed to ensure a more balanced approach. Specifically, the inclusion of 7 huge sites around Murton is wrong and will lead to those sites joining up with existing buildings to create a massive built-up area at the coast, without green spaces. There will be consequent problems with traffic, health care and education provision. A number of important sites, currently well used for leisure purposes by residents of all ages, have been included ; these should be removed. No sports sites should be included in the Plan. Allotments are included; these sites should be removed too from the Plan. Allotments are much needed for growing food with associated health and leisure benefits. The last Conservative administration increased the number of allotments in response to demand from residents but there is still a waiting list. To allow development on allotments is wrong.</p>	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6625	No	<p>This policy states that the cumulative capacity of all sites shown on the Policy Map equals 12,950 homes. In light of the above comments on the proposed housing figures, this is not considered sufficient to meet objectively assessed need in the borough. Despite the LPA's assertion that the excess</p>	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					need will be retained in neighbouring authorities through lower levels of in-migration to North Tyneside, there are serious concerns over the level of co-operation undertaken to reach this conclusion. In light of this it is considered that the council should plan to meet their own needs. Therefore the LPA should re-assess sites not considered deliverable in the SHLAA and, if necessary, undertake a comprehensive review of the Green Belt.	Development Sites
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6148	Yes	Policy S/7.3 advises that the suitability of a site’s inclusion in the Plan will be influenced, at least in part, by any impacts upon heritage assets. This goes to the heart of what English Heritage seeks in order for the Plan to satisfy the NPPF as regards site sustainability. Comments above refer.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
408348	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	The Coal Authority	LPCD4089		Test of Soundness 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 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. Reason “ This policy recognises both the issue of constraint affecting delivery/viability but also acknowledges the beneficial opportunity development can bring to address/mitigate those constraints. As such the policy is considered positive, justified and effective.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6227		The selection criteria proposed is generally supported and the Agency welcomes that consideration will be given to the sustainability of each site, the access and highway constraints and the potential of sites to mitigate their impact. Whilst in principle the general strategic distribution of future housing development does not present any concerns and the focus on delivery within the Main Urban Area	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>can generally be supported. Again, the Agency is not currently in a position to determine whether the network is fully capable of supporting the housing strategy or whether further improvements may be required. Once the quantum and distribution of future housing development has been finalised, the Agency will be able to determine what the implications are for the network and whether any additional improvements will be required. Again, in accordance with DfT Circular 02/2013, where future strategic growth will have implications for the SRN, the Agency will require any capacity enhancements or infrastructure required to deliver this growth to be identified within the Local Plan. This should help to provide greater certainty and viability to the delivery of the Plans proposals and to the delivery of the infrastructure improvements required to support and deliver the strategy.</p>	Sites
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes (Newcastle )	LPCD6028		<p>Over 80% of the houses required over the Plan period will be accommodated within the main urban area, where viability issues are greatest. We are supportive of this allocation towards Killingworth “ east and west. BDW are currently looking at/developing a number of sites in Killingworth, Benton and Longbenton. We also agree with the priority areas set out for housing: North South “ Wallsend, the Coast and the North West. The Council should consider introducing additional sites outside of the main area to provide additional flexibility to ensure successful delivery of housing. The viability issues identified in the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment, 2010 with the sites in the Main Urban Area, North Shields, Wallsend, the Coast and the North West must be addressed. It is important these sites are deliverable early on in the Plan process. Perhaps the Council could introduce a Plan, Monitor, Manage approach which introduces measures to assist the delivery of sites if they do not come forward: “ Supporting facilitating bids for funding to unlock sites and through land assembly “ Relax S106 and CIL requirements where this would enable otherwise unviable housing sites to come forward The total capacity of all the sites identified is 12,950 dwellings, which the Council states as sufficient to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the area. This is not sufficient given the Council’s objectively assessed need of 16,272 dwellings. Even removing existing planning permissions (an unlikely scenario, which assumes all existing permissions or ones minded to grant, will be built out) leaves an unmet housing requirement of 981 based on the sites identified. The supply based on the sites identified in the Plan would only be appropriate if the Council can use the lower housing requirement figure of 10,500 “ 12,000 based on neighbouring</p>	S/7.3 Distribtion of Potential Housing Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					authorities accepting a proportion of the borough's need. The Plan emphasises throughout that only a proportion of sites will be needed to meet the borough's need up to 2030, this is not the case – all sites would need to come forward for development, still leaving a shortfall. The lack of sites identified to accommodate need identifies a need for the Council to conduct a comprehensive review of the Green Belt to identify further sites.	
639692	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	W.B. Kerr Luxury Coaches Ltd	LPCD275			S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
424290	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Alpha Recovery	LPCD1129		Ranked as 2: Close to public transport networks Provides affordable housing Safe access to local amenities (e.g. open space and play areas) Ranked as 3: Close to facilities (e.g. shops and schools) Provides a range of different types of housing Can bring improvements to the quality and range of local facilities Financially capable of being developed Ranked as 4: Can provide appropriately- sized gardens Ranked as 5: Close to places of work Development densities in keeping with the local area Can accommodate new businesses	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
474717	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Modrec Holdings Ltd	LPCD3453	Yes	In particular I wish to support the policy link to the 'schedule of the sites proposed for consultation set out within the section Potential Development Sites to the rear of this Local Plan consultation Draft' and contained in the linked document (the background paper, Local Plan Consultation draft: Potential Development sites). It is appreciated that your draft document recognises the difficulty in bringing marginal brownfield sites to the market to regenerate some parts of the borough and whilst not a policy the following text is appreciated in connection with West Chirton – Para 7.30. The viability of sites was indeed assessed by the borough in the report it commissioned by Fordham's in 2010. The report identified the West Chirton site with a negative return and therefore not likely to be able to contribute to the council's affordable homes targets. This is recognised in principle by the Council in the draft in the following supportive statement – Para 7.43 The site the document refers to is partly in my companies ownership and I support its regeneration that is 'Site 78; West Chirton South, Norham road, North shields' Potential Homes: 420. I request you take my comments on board into the next draft of your plans and request you keep me informed of any issue relevant to my interests	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					outlined above.	
804019	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Owen Pugh Ltd	LPCD2625	In part	<p>Fairhurst recognise that Policy S/7.3 “Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites” of the Local Plan Consultation Draft identifies that the selection of a preferred range of housing sites to meet identified needs will be informed by the following: a) The sustainability appraisal of each site; b) Evidence of the suitability, availability and overall economic viability of the sites for delivery taking into account the constraints affecting potential development sites and the potential for delivery to mitigate any impacts - including biodiversity, sustainable access and highways, flood risk and heritage assets; c) Where alternative uses might be appropriate the overall requirements and suitability of sites for that use; and d) The evidence provided by responses through this Local Plan Consultation Draft. Fairhurst have below responded to the above criteria identified in Policy S/7.3 “Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites”: Suitability for Housing Fairhurst wish to highlight that the Grieves Row site 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 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. Fairhurst on behalf of Owen Pugh, wish to confirm that, although the current use of the site is employment use, Owen Pugh expect to vacate the site, facilitating the development of housing on the site in the next 5 years. Fairhurst note that the current Consultation Draft of the Local Plan does not identify proposed housing allocations. The Consultation Draft simply identifies a range of potential development sites for a range of uses. Fairhurst expect that a number of representations will be submitted by landowners and developers in relation to sites. Many of these sites will have been identified as potential development sites in the Local Plan Consultation Draft but have not previously been considered acceptable for housing development by NTC by inclusion within the 5 year housing land supply. Fairhurst wish to highlight that the Grieves Row site has, up until now, been considered suitable for housing by NTC. Fairhurst have reviewed the spatial strategy and detailed policies of the Consultation Draft and consider that no new evidence has been presented in the emerging Local Plan</p>	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>which suggests that the proposed residential development of the Grieves Row site would be unsuitable. As identified in previous submissions, Fairhurst consider that the redevelopment of the site for housing would represent logical, sustainable development based on the following:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The redevelopment of the site will enable Owen Pugh to relocate to suitable premises which meet their business requirements;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• The existing transport infrastructure is no longer adequate to support employment use on site;</li> <li>• Housing development on the site represents sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF;</li> <li>• The site is brownfield land;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• The suitability of the area for housing has been proven by other recent housing developments in the Dudley area;</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Redevelopment of the site would prioritise sustainable methods of transport including pedestrian movement, cycling and public transport.</li> </ul>                     Deliverability of Housing Fairhurst wish to note that the delivery of the Grieves Row site has been delayed for the last six years due to market conditions. However, Fairhurst can confirm, on behalf of Owen Pugh, that the site remains available and that the site will be developed when economic conditions improve. Owen Pugh has indicated that it is very likely that development will occur within the next 5 years due to the need to relocate business premises and improving market conditions. Within North Tyneside and across the North East, a number of brownfield sites have not been delivered due to market conditions following the housing market crash in 2008. Notwithstanding this, as confidence appears to be returning to the housing market, Fairhurst consider that it is necessary for the most logical and sustainable sites to be supported and the Consultation Draft provides clear support for the prioritising of brownfield land for development under Policy DM/2.2 General Development Principles. Owen Pugh support that the Local Plan Consultation Draft prioritises brownfield land. Paragraph 154 of the NPPF states that "local plans should be aspirational but realistic." Fairhurst consider                 </p>	



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>that it is aspirational but realistic for the site to be fully redeveloped for housing within the plan period. Fairhurst wish to highlight that the enclosed previous submissions have provided information regarding contamination, flood risk, ecology, noise, transport and traffic, health and safety, local utilities and infrastructure and accessibility. Fairhurst consider that an appropriate level of information has been provided to demonstrate the deliverability of the site. However, if considered necessary by NTC, Owen Pugh could provide further technical and environmental information to further justify deliverability of the Grieves Row site. Fairhurst would request that we are contacted should any additional information be required. Housing and Population Background Paper Constraints Assessment Fairhurst have reviewed the "Map of Known Site Constraints" in relation to the Grieves Row site in the Housing and Population Background Paper. Fairhurst wish to highlight and confirm the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not within Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3;</li> <li>• There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments within or in close proximity to the site;</li> <li>• The site is not located within a Conservation Area or within close proximity to a Conservation Area;</li> <li>• The site is not located within the Green Belt;</li> <li>• The site is not a Ramsar Site or in close proximity to a Ramsar site;</li> <li>• The site is not a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or in close proximity to a SSSI;</li> <li>• The site is not a Local Wildlife Site or in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site;</li> <li>• The site is not a Site of Local Conservation Interest or in close proximity to a Site of Local Conservation Interest; and</li> <li>• The site is not a World Heritage Site or in close proximity to a World Heritage Site.</li> </ul> <p>Fairhurst note that the "Map of Known Site Constraints" identifies that a very small area of the site is allocated as Open Space within the adopted development plan. However, it is considered that this area of Open Space could be protected and enhanced as part of any future development proposal for the site. Fairhurst note that the "Map of Known Site Constraints" identifies that approximately 25% of the site is susceptible to 1 in 75 year surface water flooding. However, Fairhurst consider that this constraint could be easily overcome by an appropriate surface water drainage solution as part of a sustainable development proposal. Sustainability Appraisal of Grieves Row The above Policy S/7.3 "Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites" contained in the Local Plan Consultation Draft states that the selection of a preferred range of housing sites will be informed by the sustainability appraisal of each site. Fairhurst have reviewed Appendix 2 "Assessment of Proposed Sites" of the Sustainability Appraisal of the</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>Consultation Draft. As part of the Sustainability Appraisal of the site, Grieves Row has been scored against 20 sustainability appraisal objectives. Fairhurst note that the Sustainability Appraisal of the Grieves Row site assesses that housing redevelopment would be more in line with sustainability objectives of the Local Plan than the current employment use on site. The long-term mitigated score of the current employment use is 20, whereas the long-term mitigated score of housing redevelopment is 26. Fairhurst note that the “mitigation” for the current employment use includes a number of very aspirational measures (as commented on below) which Owen Pugh consider are counter-productive to existing operations on site and Owen Pugh have no proposals to implement any of the identified mitigation measures. It should be noted that a continuation of the current employment use without any retrofitted mitigation, would result in a sustainability score of minus 3. Fairhurst consider that it is clear that providing support for the redevelopment of the site for housing is a more sustainable policy direction for the Local Plan to take. Based on the above, Fairhurst consider that NTC’s Sustainability Appraisal clearly demonstrates that the residential redevelopment of the Grieves Row site would be more sustainable than retaining the site in employment use. Fairhurst have below provided comment on the assessment of the site in the Sustainability Appraisal: Objective 1 “ 3 (employment) “ Fairhurst agree that the redevelopment of the site would produce jobs in construction. Fairhurst can also confirm that when the site is progressed for housing redevelopment, the current employment use will be relocated to an alternative, more appropriate site and therefore, permanent employment associated with Owen Pugh’s occupation of the site will be retained elsewhere in the local area. Objective 6 (housing) “ Fairhurst support and agree with the assessment made by NTC which states that if the existing use remains there may not be enough housing within the area for local need. This is demonstrated by the lack of other housing sites identified in the Dudley area. Objective 7 (safe, crime free neighbourhoods) “ Fairhurst consider that the redevelopment of the site for housing should receive a stronger sustainability assessment score in relation to this objective. 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. The redevelopment of the site for housing would result in a more harmonious relationship in uses within the local area. Additionally, Fairhurst consider that it is an existing and emerging planning policy requirement for the redevelopment</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>of the site to create a safe and crime free environment. Based on this, it is expected that any redevelopment proposal for the site would be expected to achieve this. Objective 8 (promote health) - the site is located within a sustainable location with good accessibility to key destinations. The redevelopment of the site is likely to improve the local environment for sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling. Additionally, the industrial nature of the site close to existing residential properties has the potential to have a larger negative impact on residential amenity than the proposed redevelopment of the site for residential use. Based on these factors, Fairhurst consider that the redevelopment of the site provides significant opportunities to promote health and healthy lifestyles. Objective 9 (access to the range of community facilities and services) - as a minimum, Fairhurst would expect NTC to consider the accessibility of the site in relation to community facilities and services. Fairhurst note that the previous SHLAA submission which is enclosed with this submission, provides information regarding the accessibility of the site. Objective 10 (community identity and active participation in community planning activities) – Fairhurst agree that the site at present does not contribute towards a strong community identity. Fairhurst consider that the redevelopment of the site for housing would provide an opportunity to create a more sustainable, mixed community within the local area. Objective 11 (ground and surface waters) – as identified above, Fairhurst consider that surface water drainage could be addressed through an appropriate design solution. Fairhurst agree that standard building practices would have been applied and the investigation and implementation of SUDs may be necessary. However, Fairhurst do not consider this to be an insurmountable issue which would prevent the delivery of the site. Fairhurst wish to note that Owen Pugh have no proposals to retrofit SUDs to a site which they are openly stating they wish to redevelop for housing. Objective 12 (climate change and efficient use of resources) – Fairhurst consider it is highly unlikely that Owen Pugh will retrofit energy efficiency measures to a site which they are expecting to relocate from and promote for housing development. Fairhurst consider that any development proposal for the site would be required to attempt to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and ensure air quality objectives are not exceeded through efficient use of resources. The site is brownfield land which is expected to be become vacant and therefore the redevelopment of the site for housing would represent efficient use of resources. The site is located in a sustainable and accessible</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>location and it is expected that sustainable modes of transport will be prioritised. Objective 13 (sustainable transport) “ the site is in close proximity to employment opportunities at Northumberland Business Park and Apex Business Village. Fairhurst consider that sustainable modes of transport could be prioritised as the site forms part of the existing built up area of Dudley.</p> <p>“Guidance on Transport Assessments” (DfT, 2007) advises that a planning application for 80 or more residential dwellings should be accompanied by a Travel Plan. Based on this, Fairhurst would expect that a future planning application for the housing redevelopment on the site would be accompanied by a Travel Plan. Additionally, it is expected that any proposal would be required to enhance pedestrian links to local bus stops. NTC have stated that the site is located in a “reasonably accessible location”. Fairhurst consider that NTC will be required to undertake a more detailed assessment of sustainability and accessibility in order to progress the Local Plan to the next stage based on the lack of evidence that has currently been presented. Objective 14 (ecology, biodiversity and geodiversity) “ Fairhurst would expect that any housing redevelopment proposal for the site would incorporate soft landscaping to support biodiversity. The site is currently brownfield land and is therefore likely to be of low ecological value. Fairhurst note that a future planning application for the redevelopment of the site for housing would be accompanied by a Phase 1 Habitat Survey. Objective 16 (Green Belt and green infrastructure) “ Owen Pugh strongly support NTC’s assessment that, as a brownfield site, the redevelopment of the Grieves Row site for housing would reduce the need to develop on greenfield sites. Objective 17 (landscape character, cultural and historic environment) - Fairhurst strongly support NTC’s assessment that the site is currently unattractive and that well integrated residential development could have a positive effect on the community. Objective 18 (flood risk) “ As identified above, Fairhurst consider that an appropriate surface water drainage scheme could be developed, in line with the NPPF Technical Guidance, to ensure that there would be no net increase in surface water run off. Objective 19 (agricultural land and contaminated land) “ Owen Pugh strongly agree that the redevelopment of the site would help to protect agricultural land by reducing the pressure for housing allocations on agricultural land. Objective 20 (noise pollution) “ Fairhurst consider that this assessment misses the key point that the redevelopment of the site will remove a noise-generating employment use and replace this with housing development which is more</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					compatible with the character of the surrounding area.	
396325	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4393		<p>Policy S/7.3 outlines the distribution of potential housing development sites. The distribution is based on the availability and suitability of sites identified through the SHLAA process and does not appear to take into account the demand for housing within the 5 Strategic Sub Areas. It is understood that an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment is currently being prepared. In line with paragraph 50 of the NPPF, which states that Local Planning Authorities should identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand, it is assumed that the SHMA will also inform the distribution of potential housing development sites across the Borough. NWL reserve the right to make further representations in relation to housing distribution across North Tyneside once the updated evidence base has been published. The Policy text notes that the sites currently identified would exceed the Borough's objectively assessed housing requirement. However, as noted above in relation to Policy S. 7 .2, NWL query whether there is sufficient evidence to reduce the housing requirement from 16,272 net additional homes to between 10,500 and 12,000 net additional homes and as such it is not clear whether the 12,950 supply identified will be sufficient or not at this stage. Notwithstanding the comments above, NWL supports the identification of potential housing sites within the Main Urban Area, including Billy Mill and the implied assumption that the Main Urban Area is a sustainable location for additional residential development. The potential development sites identified on the draft proposals map include the Moorhouses Reservoir site (Ref.No.42). The assessment of the site in the Potential Sites Background Paper shows that there are no significant site constraints. For clarification the site lies completely within Flood Zone 1. 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 with a potential yield of around 96 dwellings. As outlined above, Moorhouses Reservoir is located on brownfield land, in close proximity to a range of local services. The SHLAA for North Tyneside confirms that the site is both available and suitable for residential development and could deliver housing within the next five years. As such it could readily be incorporated into the urban grain of Billy Mill and contribute to the Council's maintenance of a defensible five year housing land supply. Whilst the development of the site would result in the loss of designated open space, it is considered that the loss of open space would be acceptable on the following</p>	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>grounds: New areas of high quality open space and green infrastructure can be incorporated into a residential development on the site; â€¢ There are a number of other areas of open space in the surrounding area, which the local community can access; â€¢ 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 â€¢ The site could make an important and positive contribution towards North Tyneside Council achieving a deliverable and sustainable housing land supply. It is noted that the Moorhouses site has also been identified as a potential employment site. Given that the site is surrounded by dwellings it is considered that the development of the site for employment could create amenity issues and as such it should be taken forward for housing, rather than employment purposes.</p>	
805376	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Wet 'n' Wild Enterprises Limited in Administration c/o PwC	LPCD3573	In part	<p>Our client would broadly support the overall housing requirement identified for the Borough and the proposed distribution detailed in Policy S/7.3.</p>	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD4921		<p>S/7.3- 'Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites' Policy S/7.3 outlines the distribution of potential housing development sites. The distribution is based on the availability and suitability of sites identified through the SHIAA process and does not appear to take into account the demand for housing within the 5 Strategic Sub Areas. It is understood that an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment is currently being prepared. In line with paragraph 50 of the NPPF, which states that Local Planning Authorities should identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand, it is assumed that SHMA will also inform the distribution of potential housing development sites across the Borough. Our Client reserves the right to make further representations in relation to housing distribution across North Tyneside once the updated evidence base has been published. The Policy text notes that the sites currently identified would exceed the Borough's objectively assessed housing requirement. However, as noted above in relation to Policy S. 7.2, our Client queries whether there is sufficient evidence to reduce the housing requirement from 16,272 net additional homes to between 10,500 and 12,000 net additional homes and as such it is not clear whether the 12,950</p>	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					supply identified will be sufficient or not at this stage. Notwithstanding the comments above, our Client supports the identification of potential housing sites within the North West Communities Strategic Sub Area and the implied assumption that settlements, such as Seaton Burn within the North West are sustainable locations for additional residential development. Our Client's site has not been identified as a potential housing site. However, as noted above, it is considered that it is a suitable, available and deliverable housing site and our Client therefore requests that it is taken forward as a housing allocation in the Local Plan.	
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4611		Policy S/7.3 outlines the distribution of potential housing development sites. The distribution is based on the availability and suitability of sites identified through the SHLAA process and does not take into account the demand for housing within the 5 Strategic Sub Areas. It is understood that an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment is currently being prepared and in line with paragraph 50 of the NPPF, which states that Local Planning Authorities should identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand, it is assumed that the SHMA will also inform the distribution of potential housing development sites across the Borough. Our Client reserves the right to make further representations in relation to housing distribution across North Tyneside once the updated evidence base has been published. The Policy text notes that the sites currently identified in the Local Plan Consultation Draft would exceed the Borough's objectively assessed housing requirement. However, as noted above in relation to Policy S.7.2, our Client queries whether there is sufficient evidence to reduce the housing requirement from 16,272 net additional homes to between 10,500 and 12,000 net additional homes and as such it is not clear whether the 12,950 dwelling potential supply identified will be sufficient or not at this stage. Notwithstanding the comments above, our Client supports the identification of potential housing sites within the Wallsend Strategic Sub Area and the implied conclusion that Wallsend is a sustainable location for additional residential development. The former St. Gobain site has not been identified as a potential housing site. However, as noted above, it is considered that it is a suitable, available and deliverable housing site and our Client therefore requests that it is identified as a housing allocation in the Local Plan.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
808367	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS		LPCD5705	No	The following paragraphs set out our client's (Mr G Oliver) comments in respect of this section. We generally support the proposed level of distribution,	S/7.3 Distribution of

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					particularly to the North West area when having regard to the contribution Site 4 can make towards the delivery of housing within this area. However, it is our client's opinion that the distribution of housing cannot be fully assessed until the housing figures across the Borough are firmly established. Our client therefore wishes to reserve the right to comment further on the distribution of housing once the overall housing figures are confirmed.	Potential Housing Development Sites
793989	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	St Columba's United Reformed Church	LPCD1134	In part	St Columba's supports the Councils development plan for housing on the Stephenson House and Northumberland House sites, and feel that housing in these areas would compliment North Shields by bringing new people to the area. However we have concerns and oppose the the redevelopment of Norfolk Street Car Park. This, we feel would reduce the numbers of people willing to park in North Shields to shop or attend the many events and community outreach services that St Columba's provides.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
588467	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	West Moor Residents' Association	LPCD2298		I would prefer further housing development to be around the A19 with suitable infrastructure in place is roads, drains etc and away from the West Moor area,8, 9, 10 & 11 which is now overdeveloped. I am not against development within the borough, but the traffic congestion around West Moor is horrendous at times & the ensuing pollution from traffic is unacceptable. I would not be opposed to sensible development to the east of the A1 in the Seaton Burn area, at present designated "Green Belt".	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites
755686	NATIONAL ORGANISATION	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4601	No	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites The distribution indicates that in excess of 80% of the housing requirement will be accommodated within the main urban area. As previously noted in comments upon Policy S/1.1 the 2010 AHVA indicates that sites within this area suffer from the greatest viability challenges. To ensure successful delivery of the plan the Council may wish to provide flexibility by providing additional sites outside of the main urban area. The policy indicates that the total capacity of identified sites is 12,950 dwellings and contends that this is sufficient to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the area. This appears to be incorrect, the Council identify an objectively assessed need of 16,272 dwellings, even once permissions are removed from this total the potential supply remains inadequate as demonstrated by the table below. The Council's calculations in Table 2 of the plan also presume that all of the existing planning permissions or which the Council is minded to grant will be built out, this is unlikely to be the case. a. Net objectively assessed housing need* 16,272 b. estimated demolitions / losses 1,360 c. gross requirement 2013/14 to 2029/30 (a+b=c) 17,632 d.	S/7.3 Distribution of Potential Housing Development Sites



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Existing planning permissions (31st March 2013) 2,495 e. Major planning permissions post March 2013 and sites minded to grant 1,206 f. Outstanding gross housing requirement (c-d-e=f) 13,931 g. Identified capacity 12,950 h. Unmet requirement (f-g=h) 981 As can be seen, the potential supply does not provide sufficient dwelling capacity for the objectively assessed need. Indeed the figure of 981 is likely to be higher as not all permissions and allocations will deliver to the rates anticipated. The figure only provides sufficient housing sites if the lower figures which seek to reduce migration levels are factored in. As previously stated this is reliant upon other authorities accepting a proportion of North Tyneside's need. To ensure the Council can provide sufficient land to accommodate its own needs it is recommended that a comprehensive review of the Green Belt is undertaken to identify further sites.	
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6698	Yes	The criteria for residential development on sites not identified within the plan is broadly consistent with the requirements of the Framework and is considered acceptable.	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development
805832	BUSINESS	Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4173	In part	7.4 Policy DM/7.4 Should be amended to include potential for both leisure and productive green space., Any planting should be within a framework across the NT which emphasises edible landscaping and planting.	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development
808279	DEVELOPER	Bett Homes	LPCD5755	Yes	The criteria for residential development on sites that are identified within the Plan is broadly consistent with the requirements of the Framework and is considered acceptable.	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6228	0	The Agency considers that site specific policies and strategic areas for housing development offer the most certain way of delivering development to meet housing demand and ensuring sites are promoted that are deliverable, particularly where they are dependent on the implementation of any infrastructure improvement to support their delivery. However, it is acknowledged that in some circumstances other suitable sites may come forward. As such, the Agency is generally supportive of the inclusion of the policy which should help to ensure that only the most sustainably located windfall sites are supported. The Agency is particularly supportive of Part c. of the criteria in the policy which seeks to ensure development is accessible to a range of sustainable transport modes, which in turn should help to encourage	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					the use of sustainable transport more reducing reliance on private cars. The Agency is also generally supportive of Part e. which requires the proposals to be capable of being accommodated by existing infrastructure or where improvements are required, contributions towards those improvements are provided.	
808367	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Oliver	LPCD5708	In part	The following comment sets out our client's (Mr G Oliver) response to this policy. Whilst we generally support the provisions of this policy, criterion e) should be amended to read: e). be accommodated by, and make best use of, existing infrastructure, and where further infrastructure requirements arise, make appropriate contribution to its provision, taking into account development viability and potential CIL contributions.	DM/7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6699	In part	Draft Policy DM/7 .5 sets out a Borough wide affordable housing requirement of 'at least 25%' on sites of 15 or more dwellings or sites of 0.5 hectares and above. The draft policy has been prepared on the basis of the findings set out within the 2010 Affordable Housing Viability Assessment which identifies significant viability constraints at the peak of the recession. It is noted that the Council is currently updating the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment and this work must be completed before this policy can progress in order to provide clear demonstration that the policy will not stymie development and j eopardise the overall deliverability of the plan. In this respect it is noted that the existing viability assessment considered a 30% affordable housing provision to be viable at the peak of the housing market in 2007 although this does not consider the range of other obligations being placed upon developers as part of the emerging plan and increasing Government requirement to improve the overall energy performance and sustainability of new residential dwellings. These matters must be considered as part of the viability assessment before the policy can be found 'sound'. Paragraphs 173 - 177 of the Framework consider the importance of careful attention to viability as part of the plan making process. In this respect, paragraph 173 states that:"The sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened". In this respect paragraph 174 goes on to consider that local authorities should assess the likely 'cumulative impact' of all existing and proposed local standards, including supplementary planning documents and policy in order to ensure they do not jeopardise development. The paragraph goes on to state that:"In order to be	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					appropriate, the cumulative impact of the standards and policies should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk, and should facilitate development throughout the economic cycle". (Signet Planning emphasis). It is clear therefore that the viability assessment should not make assumptions on future viability but should ensure the plan is deliverable from the date of adoption it is also clear that the Framework makes a definitive connection between housing delivery and economic performance.	
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4658	0	Policy DM/7.5 Affordable Housing of the Consultation Draft Local Plan states that "To meet a Borough-wide target for at least 25% of all new homes to be affordable, new developments of 15 or more dwellings, or on sites of 0.5 ha or more, must include the maximum proportion of affordable housing taking into consideration specific site circumstances and economic viability." PFP and Fairhurst note that the existing outline planning permission for Smith's Dock does not accord with the above affordable housing requirement. However, the proposed affordable housing provision has already been approved as part of the existing planning permission. The future reserved matters planning applications will be based on the previously approved provision.	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6626	In part	An affordable housing policy is a key part of any Local Plan " both to provide an appropriate level of affordable housing to meet local need and to ensure that development viability is not adversely impacted by providing this. It is a balance which needs to be based upon a solid evidence base. The proposed 25% appears to have been arrived at through considering previous viability assessments and past trends in the housing market. The 25% was arrived at as it represented the mid-point between the findings of previous Affordable Housing Viability Assessments (AHVA). However this approach is inconsistent as it didn't take into account 2009 as it was considered to be the "nadir" of the housing market. Furthermore the AHVA doesn't take into account the wider burdens on development viability from other local and national planning policy in addition to costs outside planning's sphere of influence. The 25% target proposed through the NTLPCD needs to be assessed in light of the SHMA update and a whole plan Economic Viability Assessment (EVA), which tests the impact of all regulatory burdens upon development. Previous viability assessments in the area have demonstrated that many areas of the borough represent development with low viability levels and as such the LPA must ensure that this policy does not represent an obstruction to development and growth. It is suggested that the policy wording should provide more certainty in terms of the	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>required percentage. From the current wording the 25% provision appears to be a minimum target above which the “maximum proportion of affordable housing” should be provided. Both house builders and land owners require certainty from the planning system, specifically when it comes to the viability of development, in order to ensure sites can come forward in an appropriate time frame. The current policy wording provides no comfort on the level of affordable housing likely to be required. Based on an updated evidence base the affordable housing percentage should be included in the NTLP as a “cap” as opposed to a minimum target. Where developers seek to provide a level of affordable housing lower than this cap then the LPA must assess site specific circumstances and viability. Thresholds: It is Persimmon Homes’ view that all new housing sites in North Tyneside should contribute towards the provision of affordable housing, unless this can be demonstrated to be unviable. In light of this there should be no threshold on the number of units “ with the proposed number of 15 considered to be extremely high. Obviously some smaller sites have no capability for on-site provision, yet they should contribute an appropriate monetary contribution which can be put towards affordable housing projects nearby. In light of the low housing targets being put forward through this iteration of the Local Plan it is even more important that all new housing developments contribute towards the provision of affordable housing in the borough. Off-site Provision: The Council’s approach in ensuring that the majority of developments provide onsite affordable housing is considered to be the correct one. However it needs to ensure that it provides a certain level of flexibility in where affordable housing provision can be accommodated. This specifically relates to “Executive Housing” where there is a need to provide affordable housing off-site. In order to support the Local Plan’s economic vision, it is likely that the level of executive units will need to be increased as the County sees increased industry and needs to provide housing for higher wage earners. Executive schemes rely not only on the size of the properties, but also the quality of the development in terms of materials, landscaping and environment. It may not be ideal, but it is a fact that “executive” developments are more attractive when they don’t contain affordable housing. Should the NTLP not allow for these truly “executive” developments to provide their fair share of affordable units off-site or through a financial contribution, then this would see “executives” commuting in from elsewhere. This would defeat the purpose of setting out an economic growth</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					strategy and would not allow the borough to reap the resultant benefits of an increased and wealthier workforce in terms of council tax, spending power and so on.	
808279	DEVELOPER	Bett Homes	LPCD5756	In part	Draft Policy DM/7.5 sets out a Borough wide affordable housing requirement of 'at least 25%' on sites of 15 or more dwellings or sites of 0.5 hectares and above. The draft policy has been prepared on the basis of the findings set out within the 2010 Affordable Housing Viability Assessment which identifies significant viability constraints at the peak of the recession. It is noted that the Council is currently updating the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment and this work must be completed before this policy can progress in order to provide clear demonstration that the policy will not stymie development and jeopardise the overall deliverability of the plan. In this respect it is noted that the existing viability assessment considered a 30% affordable housing provision to be viable at the peak of the housing market in 2007 although this does not consider the range of other obligations being placed upon developers as part of the emerging plan and increasing Government requirement to improve the overall energy performance and sustainability of new residential dwellings. These matters must be considered as part of the viability assessment before the policy can be found 'sound'. Paragraphs 173 - 177 of the Framework consider the importance of careful attention to viability as part of the plan making process. In this respect, paragraph 173 states that:"The sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened". In this respect paragraph 174 goes on to consider that local authorities should assess the likely 'cumulative impact' of all existing and proposed local standards, including supplementary planning documents and policy in order to ensure they do not jeopardise development. The paragraph goes on to state that:"In order to be appropriate, the cumulative impact of the standards and policies should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk, and should facilitate development throughout the economic cycle". (Signet Planning emphasis). It is clear therefore that the viability assessment should not make assumptions on future viability but should ensure the plan is deliverable from the date of adoption it is also clear that the Framework makes a definitive connection between housing delivery and economic performance.	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes	LPCD6033	0	The policy sets a requirement for the provision of 25% affordable housing on all sites of 15 dwellings or greater. We have some concern over the viability of	DM/7.5 Affordable

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
		(Newcastle )			providing 25% affordable housing on sites. The Council’s Affordable Housing Viability Assessment, 2010 illustrates that at this level of provision none of the sites would be viable. Viability issues on these sites will be further exacerbated by the forthcoming push for zero carbon homes. 25% of 16,272 equals 4,068 affordable homes, which is 239 homes per annum out of a requirement of 957. The Council must evaluate whether this figure is truly deliverable or whether it will stall sites/developments. Para 173-177 of the NPPF clearly states that the cumulative impacts of policy contributions and obligations should not unduly burden development. The Plan mentions that North Tyneside Council and North Tyneside Homes are working on the delivery of 2,500 – 3,000 new Council Homes over the next 15 years. This could play an important part in the delivery of a large proportion of the affordable housing requirement. We would urge the Council to provide more details on this and clarification of whether such a proposal will come forward within the Plan period.	Housing
396325	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4394	0	NWL considers that Policy DM/7.5 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." Accordingly, we suggest the following changes: The Council will seek [To meet a Borough wide target for at least - this text to be deleted] 25% of all new homes to be affordable on new housing developments of 15 or more dwellings or on sites of 0.5ha or more [must include the maximum proportion of affordable housing taking into consideration - text to be deleted], 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. It is also noted that a Strategic Housing Market Assessment ("SHMA") 2013 update is underway, and NWL look forward to reviewing the document and commenting further on this affordable housing policy, as appropriate, when it is published.	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4824	0	Our Client considers that Policy DM/7.5 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." Accordingly, our Client suggests the following changes: The Council will seek 25% of all new homes to be affordable on new housing developments of 15 or more dwellings or on sites of 0.5ha or more, 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. It is also noted	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					that a Strategic Housing Market Assessment ("SHMA") 2013 update is underway. Our Client reserves the right to review the document and comment further on this affordable housing policy, as appropriate, when it is published.	
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD4923	0	Policy DM/7 .5 - 'Affordable Housing' Our Client considers that Policy DM/7 .5 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." Accordingly, our Client suggest the following changes: The Council will seek [To meet a Borough wide target for at least] 25% of all new homes to be affordable on new housing developments of 15 or more dwellings or on sites of 0.5ha or more, [must include the maximum proportion of affordable housing taking into consideration] 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. It is also noted that a Strategic Housing Market Assessment ("SHMA") 2013 update is underway. Our Client reserves the right to review the document and comment further on this affordable housing policy, as appropriate, when it is published.	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
808367	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Oliver	LPCD5710	In part	The following paragraphs set out our client's (Mr G Oliver) comments in respect of this policy. Whilst we generally support the policy, our main comment is in relation to criterion b) and the requirement that 'the volume of affordable housing to be provided would be equivalent to, or greater than, the volume that would be viable if the provision was made on-site'. Firstly, it is not clear why if off-site provision is permitted, this should need to be greater than any provision on-site. We object to a 'greater' amount of affordable housing being provided off-site and require further clarification and justification as to this requirement. Indeed the NPPF (para 50) requires 'a financial contribution of a broadly equivalent value' in respect of off-site affordable housing/financial contributions and there is no mention of a 'greater' provision that required on-site. Additionally, the use of the term 'volume' requires clarification. We suggest that 'number' would be more appropriate and that criterion b) should state: "Where off-site affordable housing is to be provided, the number of affordable housing units to be provided, would be equivalent to the number that would be viable if the provision was made on-site". The key to affordable housing provision is viability of each development site, this should be the key consideration. Similar comments apply to criterion c). We suggest that criterion c) is amended to read: "Where a Commuted Sum is to be provided it will be equivalent to the amount that would be viable if the provision was made on-site". Further clarification is	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					also needed as to how financial contributions will be determined with regard to Commuted Sums.	
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6656	In part	The Trust consider the Policy should reflect paragraph 50 of the NPPF which states: "policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of the changing market conditions over time." Accordingly, the Trust suggest the following changes: The Council will seek To meet a Borough-wide target for at least 25% of all new homes to be affordable on new housing developments of 15 or more dwellings or on sites of 0.5ha or more, must include the maximum proportion of affordable housing taking into consideration 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. It is noted that a Strategic Housing Market Assessment ("SHMA") 2013 update is underway and the Trust look forward to reviewing the document and commenting further on affordable housing, as appropriate, when it is published.	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing
755686	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4602	In part	The policy requires 25% affordable housing on all sites of 15 dwellings or greater. The Council's SHMA, albeit out of date, clearly illustrates the need for affordable housing. Whilst the need for affordable housing is clear the 2010 AHVA undertaken on behalf of the Council by Fordham Research 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. Paragraphs 173 to 177 of the NPPF are clear that the cumulative impacts of policy contributions and obligations should not unduly burden development. The AHVA clearly illustrates that the current affordable housing requirement would have this effect and threaten delivery of the plan. Whilst the plan suggests viability was greater in the past (paragraph 7.45) both the Harmon review (Local Housing Delivery Group: Viability Testing Local Plans, 2012), as well as numerous examinations are clear that the Council should not set policies which speculate upon future viability. It is clear that the plan must be viable in the first five years of the plan period and therefore current values are those which should form the basis of the affordable housing requirement. 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. It is noted that the Council are	DM/7.5 Affordable Housing



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					undertaking further assessment work on viability. To comply with the requirements of the NPPF it is recommended that this work considers not only affordable housing but the full cumulative costs of its policies and obligations. The current evidence suggests that the Council may have to prioritise its policy requirements balancing the need for affordable housing against infrastructure and other policy requirements. It is also recommended that the policy indicates that the Council would be willing to vary its affordable housing requirement where viability issues are raised. It is, however, important that such a policy stance is not used to justify an unsustainable policy requirement.	
						7.6
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6700	No	Draft Policy DM/7.7 seeks to regulate house sizes across different tenures based upon the existing 2009 SHMA. In this respect it is already accepted that the 2009 SHMA is not up-to-date and a new SHMA is due to be published imminently. On the basis that the SHMA is likely to be reviewed and updated on a more regular basis than the Local Plan it is considered the policy should simply refer to the up-to-date SHMA rather than seeking to identify specific household sizes which may conflict with an up-to-date SHMA, as the plan period progresses. As currently drafted it is considered the policy fails the 'effective' test of soundness and a more simple policy which relates to an up to date SHMA would continue to be consistent with paragraph 50 of the Framework.	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6627	No	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size: This policy is considered to represent an inflexible approach to housing mix based on an out-of-date SHMA, and one which is not considered suitable to span the plan period. It should be re-worded and simplified to state that new housing developments must have regard to the housing needs of the borough as set out in an up to date SHMA.	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
808279	DEVELOPER	Bett Homes	LPCD5758	No	Draft Policy DM/7. 7 seeks to regulate house sizes across different tenures based upon the existing 2009 SHMA. In this respect it is already accepted that the 2009 SHMA is not up-to-date and a new SHMA is due to be published imminently. On the basis that the SHMA is likely to be reviewed and updated on a more regular basis than the Local Plan it is considered the policy should simply refer to the up-to-date SHMA rather than seeking to identify specific household sizes which may conflict with an up-to-date SHMA, as the plan period progresses. As currently drafted it is considered the policy fails the 'effective' test of soundness and a more simple policy which relates to an up to date SHMA would continue to be	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					consistent with paragraph 50 of the Framework.	
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes (Newcastle )	LPCD6034	0	The range of housing sizes set out under this policy is not sufficiently flexible to deal with changing market conditions, nor account for geographic variations across the plan area. We do not believe it is appropriate to have a policy that sets out a range of housing sizes on such a specific basis. Such a policy would either stall sites or slow down delivery. The housing type and sizes needed should be identified by housebuilders based on individual site characteristics and in accordance with the SHMA. This prescriptive policy should be deleted, or if retained made more flexible and simply make reference to having regard to the SHMA. The policy should recommend housing size is appropriate to the site, location, need etc. and encourage a consideration of the need for executive homes in the borough.	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
396325	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4395	0	NWL consider that Policy DM/7. 7 is too prescriptive and provides limited flexibility to enable housing needs to be fully 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.") Paragraph 7.52 states that" ... this information will be updated by the new SHMA to be published in late 2013". Evidently the Policy, as drafted, is based on an out-of-date SHMA and therefore does not afford sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing market circumstance. The Policy as drafted also does not account for geographic variations across the Borough. NWL therefore suggest that the wording of Policy DM/7. 7 is amended to read as follows: To ensure housing delivery provides for the needs of all household types, proposals for new housing development of 15 or more homes, or on sites of 0.5 ha or more [must - deleted] should, allowing for specific circumstances and the market viability of each site, seek to provide a mix of housing which takes into account the latest evidence within the most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment [All remaining bullet points a) b) and c) should be deleted]	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4825	0	Our Client considers that Policy DM/7. 7 is too prescriptive and provides limited flexibility to enable housing needs to be fully 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."). Paragraph 7.52 states that" ... this information will be updated by the new SHMA to be published in late 2013". Evidently the Policy, as drafted, is based on an out-of-date SHMA and therefore does not afford sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing market circumstances. The Policy as drafted also does not account for	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					geographic variations across the Borough. Our Client therefore suggests that the wording of Policy DM/7. 7 is amended to read as follows: To ensure housing delivery provides for the needs of all household types, proposals for new housing development of 15 or more homes, or on sites of 0.5 ha or more must should, allowing for specific circumstances and the market viability of each site, seek to provide a mix of housing which takes into account the latest evidence within the most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.	
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD4933	0	Policy DM/7. 7- 'Range of Housing Sites' Our Client considers that Policy DM/7.7 is too prescriptive and provides limited flexibility to enable housing needs to be fully 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. ") Paragraph 7.52 states that "this information will be updated by the new SHMA to be published in late 2013". Evidently the Policy, as drafted, is based on an out-of-date SHMA and therefore does not afford sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing market circumstance. The Policy as drafted also does not account for geographic variations across the Borough. Our Client therefore suggests that the wording of Policy DM/7.7 is amended to read as follows: To ensure housing delivery provides for the needs of all household types, proposals for new housing development of 15 or more homes, or on sites of 0. 5 ha or more [must] should, allowing for specific circumstances and the market viability of each site, seek to provide a mix of housing which takes into account the latest evidence within the most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment [allowing for the latest evidence of housing needs, specific circumstances and the market viability' of each site; have regard to the following: a. For market housing: i. 10% one bedroom homes; ii. 30% two bedroom homes; iii. 20% three bedroom homes; iv. 40% four plus bedroom homes. b. For intermediate affordable housing: i. 20% one bedroom homes; ii . 80% two bedroom homes. c. For social rented affordable housing: i. 60% one and two bedroom homes; ii 40% three and four plus bedroom homes]	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
808367	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Oliver	LPCD5702	In part	Our client (Mr G Oliver) accepts the need for a range of housing sizes across the Borough. However, policy DM/7.7 as currently drafted is far too prescriptive and does not seem to take into account that over time, proportions of need with regard to housing size and areas of need change. Our client is of the firm opinion that each site needs to respond to its market and therefore the policy should be able to be applied flexibly and as a guide for achieving an appropriate mix, placing more emphasis on need at the time of the development coming forward	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					than needs ascribed within the policy as currently drafted. The text at 7.52 indicates the SHMA will be updated in late 2013. The policy is therefore potentially out of date; a clear indication that a less prescriptive and more flexible policy is required.	
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6659	No	The Trust consider that Policy DM/7.7 is too prescriptive and provides limited flexibility to enable housing growth to be fully met in accordance with paragraph 14 of NPPF which confirms: “Local plans should meet objectively assessed needs with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.” 3.10 Further, we note paragraph 7.52 which states that “this information will be updated by the new SHMA to be published in late 2013”. Evidently the Policy, as drafted, is based on an out-of-date SHMA and therefore does not afford sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing market circumstance. Further, the Policy does not account for geographic variations across the Borough. 3.11 The Trust therefore suggest that the wording of Policy DM/7.7 is amended as follows to read: To ensure housing delivery provides for the needs of all household types, proposals for new housing development of 15 or more homes, or on sites of 0.5 ha or more should, allowing for specific circumstances and the market viability of each site, have regard to the latest evidence within the most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
755686	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4603	No	The policy aims to dictate house sizes based upon the outcomes of the SHMA. Whilst the need for a variety and mix of house types and sizes is not disputed the Council should not seek to place mandatory controls upon this. The policy is currently written on the basis of an out of date SHMA, and whilst it is noted this will be varied dependent upon more up to date evidence, it does not provide sufficient flexibility to deal with changing market circumstances, nor does the policy account for geographic variations across the plan area. It is contended that the industry is best placed to identify the demand for different house sizes across the area dependent upon individual site characteristics. The net effect of the policy will be either to stall sites or slow down delivery and not meet demand. It is recommended that this prescriptive policy be deleted, if the Council wishes to retain a policy upon housing mix this should be far more flexible and simply make reference to having regard to the SHMA.	DM/7.7 Range of Housing Size
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6149	In part	Policy DM/7.8 “ applications for self-build housing should, above all else, demonstrate their sustainability.	DM/7.8 Self Build

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4659	0	DM7.9 Executive Housing, does not make clear where such developments are considered acceptable and it would be expected that specific allocations should be made.	DM/7.9 Large Executive Housing
						7.1
807438	PLANNING CONSULTANCY	Rapleys	LPCD5122	Yes	Support Policy DM/7.11 Extra Care/Specialist Housing. This confirms the Council's support for this type of accommodation where it is integrated within existing communities and would have no detrimental impact, in terms of traffic. It is considered that Albion House (Site 64) potentially offers a suitable site for residential/specialist care accommodation.	DM/7.11 Extra Care / Specialist Housing
						7.12
805832	BUSINESS	Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4182	In part	Policy S/7.13 should be amended to Improve the Quality of Existing Housing Stock as this has the greatest potential for achieving the Objectives. The planning and development control should actively promote, enable and accommodate the changes to appearance this may bring.	S/7.13 Protecting the Quality of Existing Housing Stock
396306	LOCAL AUTHORITY	South Tyneside Council,	LPCD2496	0	As regards gypsy and traveller provision, paragraph 7.91 suggests that there is no identified need for any such provision in North Tyneside. We would, however, advise that that 2009 Tyne & Wear study did identify a need for 9 gypsy and traveller pitches in North Tyneside during 2008-2018 as well as recommending a need for each of the local authorities to contribute towards providing for an additional sub-regional need for 10-15 transit pitches across the five authorities, in addition to the individual requirements for each authority area. We nevertheless note that North Tyneside Council are currently commissioning an update of the authority's needs which will further inform these policy requirements and any need to allocate sites.	7 Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
591349	LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4097	In part	Northumberland Wildlife Trust supports point 'c' of this policy for no adverse impact to biodiversity; however we question why such as statement cannot be included within all development policies.	DM/7.14 Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
						Travelling Showpeople
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6151	In part	Policy DMM/7.14 “ criterion (c) should also require there to be no unjustified adverse impacts upon any heritage assets in the locality.	DM/7.14 Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6153	0	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.	8 Green Infrastructure
396365	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	LPCD6735	0	Para 8.11 – refers to the Councils Green Space Strategy and the extent to which green space varies across the borough. However, it is not clear how deficiencies in provision can be addressed and balanced with development. Para 8.12 – has an updated Green Space Strategy been produced yet?	8 Green Infrastructure
789566	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Environment Agency	LPCD5345	Yes	We 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.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
803900	LOCAL AUTHORITY	Northumberland County Council	LPCD2640	0	Policy S/8.1 and paragraph 8.2 Green Infrastructure does not stop at local authority boundaries; reference should be made to the on-going work with Northumberland and neighbouring authorities to align strategic Green Infrastructure networks and assets. The need to protect and enhance cross border Green Infrastructure networks should be recognised in Policy 8.1.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6139	Yes	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. Policy S/8.1. 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. Paragraph 8.2 and 8.4. Whilst we welcome the acknowledgment of the benefits of Green Infrastructure, it should	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					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.	
685112		0 Sport England	LPCD2718	Yes	Green Infrastructure is defined in the Plan as including outdoor sports provision. Accordingly Sport England wishes to offer its support to policy S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure, and the development management policy DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
591349		0 northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4014	Yes	Whilst we agree with this policy, the LPA will need to fund the "relevant up-to-date evidence" base, as at present this information is not available.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
591349		0 northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4117	In part	Policy S/8.1. 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. Paragraph 8.2 and 8.4. Whilst we welcome the acknowledgement 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.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
638268		0 Natural History Society of Northumbria	LPCD4150	In part	We support this policy but are concerned that planners and politicians do not always understand that all the functions of green infrastructure can not be fulfilled in one site. In particular wildlife needs areas where there is no public access in order that they can escape the presence of humans and their pets. Only on large sites can this be achieved. In many instances green infrastructure provides very little habitat for wildlife because it is intensively managed for recreation by humans or is too small or narrow to have meaningful wildlife value. On this basis we are concerned that the Plan does not provide sufficient space for wildlife and that the increase in development will almost certainly result in a net loss of biodiversity in North Tyneside.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
805832		0 Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4188	In part	The policy S/8.1 Green Infrastructure can be directly supported through new developments learning from the Garden City approach to design of healthy productive environments for people.	S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure
396365	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North	LPCD6733	0	Policy S/8.1 (Strategic Green Infrastructure) states the Council will seek the	S/ 8.1

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
		Tyneside Council			'protection, enhancement, extension and creation of green infrastructure'. I note, however, that two of the proposed housing allocation sites (site14 & 33) are allotment sites that would be lost if developed for housing. This creates a conflict with the above policy, as the allotment sites would not be protected. (I assume alternative provision would be created)	Strategic Green Infrastructure
789566	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Environment Agency	LPCD5346	Yes		DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6142	In part	It is unclear what an alternative Green Infrastructure function is. We welcome the recognition that if development impinges on Green Infrastructure that alternative provision should maintain green infrastructure connections. 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.	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
685112	NATIONAL ORGANISATION	Sport England	LPCD2719	Yes	Green Infrastructure is defined in the Plan as including outdoor sports provision. Accordingly Sport England wishes to offer its support to policy S/ 8.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure, and the development management policy DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure.	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
591349	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4118	0	It is unclear what an 'alternative Green Infrastructure function' is. We (Northumberland Wildlife Trust) welcome the recognition that if development impinges on Green Infrastructure that alternative provision should maintain green infrastructure connections. 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	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					of this document contradict this aim.	
805405	NATIONAL ORGANISATION	The Woodland Trust	LPCD4015	In part	We are pleased to see that trees and woods are recognised as an important component of green infrastructure in North Tyneside. This represents a strong policy for protection of the green infrastructure network and recognises its importance in providing not just environmental but also social and economic benefits for local people. The reference to flood management is particularly topical and trees and woods are particularly well placed to contribute to this if planted in appropriate locations. Our concern about the wording is the statement that permission may be granted for removal of GI if equivalent or better provision can be made elsewhere. There are certain types of natural and semi natural greenspace, such as ancient woodland, whose ecology is so complex that it is irreplaceable. We would like to see the policy state explicitly that such habitats cannot be adequately replaced by other provision.	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
396365	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	LPCD6734	0	it is not clear what “an alternative green infrastructure function” means in paragraph 1 of this policy	DM/8.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4660	In part	PfP supports the protection and delivery of green infrastructure but question if such a specific policy as DM 8.3 can be delivered on urban sites or where topography make present challenges. The policy should reflect this and also set out how sites will be managed in perpetuity.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6144	Yes	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.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
469361	RESIDENT/COMMUNITY/ASSOCIATION	Commissioners Wharf Residents Association	LPCD4161	Yes	The land between Royal Quays Marina and the Northumbria Quay has been a cause for concern for the past decade. At the 2007 Public Enquiry the land was described as 'unsuitable for residential development'. It is a highly visible area which should be integrated into the Port facilities or turned into a maintained green space instead of the eyesore it has now become.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
591349	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4119	In part	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.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
805405	NATIONAL ORGANISATION	The Woodland Trust	LPCD4023	In part	We strongly support the use of access standards to determine the need for particular types of green infrastructure in North Tyneside. In particular, we welcome the use of standards for access to semi-natural greenspace, which appear to be broadly based upon the Natural England Access to Natural Greenspace Standard. Trees and woods are able to provide some benefits for local communities which are not provided by some other types of greenspace. For example, trees can remove pollutants from the atmosphere, they can help to mitigate climate change by removing carbon from the atmosphere and they can provide shade to help cool urban areas during periods of hot weather. Because of the particular importance of trees and woods, the Woodland Trust believes that everyone should have woodland close to their home and we have developed an Access to Woodland Standard, which is endorsed by both Natural England and the Forestry Commission. Our standard aspires that everyone should have a wood of at least 2 hectares within 500 metres of their home and a 20 hectare wood within 4 kilometres. Currently our standard indicates that less than 2 per cent of people in North Tyneside have a small wood within walking distance (ie 500 metres) of their home. We hope you will consider our Access to Woodland Standard for inclusion in your local plan and we would be happy to discuss how this may be done. Some local authorities (eg Leeds City Council) have used our Access standard to derive woodland creation targets for inclusion in their planning policies.	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards
808279	DEVELOPER	Bett Homes	LPCD5760	In part	Policy DM/8.3 (Green Space Provision and Standards) sets out the Council's approach to protection of green/open space. The Council relies upon their 2008 Green Space Strategy in identification of green spaces within the Borough although it is noted that this Green Space Strategy is being updated to be available in Winter 2013. In order to be in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework it is essential that the Council's evidence base and assessment of green/open space meets the definition set out in Annex 2 of the Glossary	DM/8.3 Green Space Provision and Standards

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>which states that:"Open space: All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity". The NPPF sets out the approach in regard to green and open spaces policy in paragraphs 73 and 74 of the NPPF. Paragraph 73 states that planning policy should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sport and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessment should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surplus of open space, sport and recreation facilities in the local area. The Council must ensure that the forthcoming updated Green Space Strategy includes a fundamental review of all sites in that they must meet the definition in the Annex as set out above, which states that that the land must be: 'Be of public value; Offer important opportunities for sport and recreation. It is noted on the plan of potential development sites published in parallel with the consultation document that the site of the former Hadrian Park First School is incorporated within a green/open space designation. The identification of this site as falling within that categorisation is fundamentally objected to in that it does not meet the definition of open space set out within the NPPF. Neither is it identified within the Council's Green Space Strategy 2008 as performing any of the green space functions listed within Policy DM/8.3. The site has not been available for public access for an excess of 10 years and cannot be considered to be of either public value given there is no access to the site and it performs no role and function or offer important opportunity for sport and recreation given the site has been declared surplus for requirements by North Tyneside Council who have entered into a contractual arrangement with Bett Homes for its disposal. The site has not been identified as providing a sport of recreation use within North Tyneside Council's 2013 Playing Pitch Strategy Assessments and therefore the site cannot be considered to offer an important opportunity for sport and recreation. The evidence base needs to be amended to reflect the correct definition of open space in the NPPF in order for it to be robust and consistent with national policy and in this respect the former Hadrian Park First School site cannot be identified for such purposes.</p>	
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Prof Howard Elcock	LPCD6537	In part	<p>North Tyneside has some important natural environment sites, including StMary's Island, which is a Ramsar site. No development should be permitted which is not fully consistent with the EU Birds and Natural Environment</p>	S/8.4 Biodiversity and

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					Directives. Any Ancient Woodlands in the Borough's area should likewise be protected from development.	Geodiversity
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6147	No	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. 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. 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 therefore considers this policy to be incomplete and not to meet the requirements of NPPF. 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. 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. 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.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
638268	0	Natural History Society of Northumbria	LPCD3977	Yes	The Natural History Society of Northumbria welcomes the mention of Gosforth Park SSSI on the borough boundary and the recognition that this site is important for biodiversity in North Tyneside.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
591349	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4120	No	Paragraph 8.18 The Northumberland Wildlife Trust welcomes the recognition that that 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. 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 therefore considers this policy to be incomplete	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					and not to meet the requirements of NPPF. 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. 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. 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.	
638268	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Natural History Society of Northumbria	LPCD4154	In part	We believe that there should be a wildlife corridor connecting Gosforth Park SSSI with West Moor Meadow (SLCI) in line with the Natural Environment White Paper and guidance from NPPF regarding creating ecological networks to link together sites of high biodiversity value. We have not seen any evidence or rationale for the wildlife corridors proposed in this plan nor have we been consulted on any.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
805405	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	The Woodland Trust	LPCD4100	No	Although it is important to protect statutory and non statutory designated sites, there is a danger that this might be taken to imply that any undesignated sites are less worthy of protection. We would prefer to see a commitment to protect all semi-natural habitats and particularly those which are very old and irreplaceable such as ancient woodland. Many ancient woods, particularly smaller fragments under two hectares which were not recorded on the Ancient Woodland Inventory, may not be protected by a designation but it is still vital that they are protected from development or from other loss or further fragmentation.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
805832	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4187	In part	Policy S/8.4 should include protection of other non-listed sites much stronger than 8.18. Policy A/8.5 (a,b,c) The policy should more actively support local communities working to make sites (either designated or not) more productive and more diverse for wildlife and human support. Creative solutions to sites to develop their environmental impact should be positively supported.	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
396365	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	LPCD6737	0	The policy wording mentions the “protection and enhancement” of biodiversity and geodiversity resources but not the “management and creation” of these assets. Paragraph 114 of NPPF states that Local Authorities should:- “set out a strategic approach to their Local Plans, planning positively for the	S/8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure”</p> <p>All sections of this policy (a-d) have one or two of these key words (i.e protection or enhancement) but do not mention management or creation of biodiversity assets.</p> <p>I note that Newcastle City Councils general policy on “Green Infrastructure and “Natural Environment” (Policy CS18) is set out as:-</p> <p>Protection, enhancement and management of green infrastructure assets, which include:</p> <p>i. Biodiversity and geodiversity assets, including designated sites, designated wildlife corridors and biodiversity action plan habitats and species.</p> <p>Perhaps rather than four separate sections to the policy (a-d), there could be one that includes all of these assets like the Newcastle example? Something that states that biodiversity and geodiversity resources will be protected, enhanced, managed and new resources created, in particular for “designated sites, designated wildlife corridors, biodiversity action plan habitats and species and wildlife links”</p> <p>If the policy is retained in its current form, there needs to be something for each part (a-d) that mentions “creation, protection, enhancement and management” of these assets. Part (b) refers to the Local BAP and at the national level we now have the ‘UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework’.</p>	
510094	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Natural England	LPCD6753	0	Policy S/8.4 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
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6150	No	<p>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. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek that point c is reworded to exclude 'where appropriate' and to replace with 'unless otherwise shown to be inappropriate'. This is a much more positive way to seek biodiversity and geodiversity features within development proposals. The</p>	DM/8.5 Managing Impacts upon Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>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' The Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek a cross reference between policies S/8.4 and DM/8.5 in point e so that developments make positive contributions to the aims of S/8.4. In reference to point f the Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek that appropriate surveys are carried out to industry guidelines. 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.</p>	
591349	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4124	No	<p>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 of 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 is it is only to seek to minimise fragmentation. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek that point c is reworded to exclude 'where appropriate' and to replace with 'unless otherwise shown to be inappropriate'. This is a much more positive way to seek biodiversity and geodiversity features within development proposals. The Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek a re-wording of point d to read 'The benefits of the development demonstrably outweigh any direct or indirect adverse impacts on the features of the site and the wider wildlife links' The Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek a cross reference between policies S/8.4 and DM/8.5 in point e so that developments make positive contributions to the aims of S/8.4. In reference to point f the Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek that appropriate surveys are carried out to industry guidelines. 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 households 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 Impacts upon Biodiversity and Geodiversity
638268	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Natural History	LPCD3979	In part	<p>The Natural History Society of Northumbria would like to see included in this policy the requirement, in the first instance, for development to be located</p>	DM/8.5 Managing

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
		Society of Northumbria			where there is least, or no, impact on biodiversity and that designated sites, wildlife corridors, etc should only be granted planning permission when no other less damaging, but still suitable, site is available within the borough.	Impacts upon Biodiversity and Geodiversity
805405	NATURAL ORGANISATION	The Woodland Trust	LPCD4105	No	We welcome the commitment to protection of habitats, to minimising fragmentation of habitats and to restoring and reconnecting habitats wherever possible. Restoration, for example, is important where ancient woodland has been cleared and replanted with conifers. We welcome para 8.22 which sets out the benefits of the policy in terms of enabling adaptation to climate change. We do not agree with points d, e and f in that they imply that loss of any site which is locally designated or a priority habitat may be permitted if mitigation or compensation measures are put forward. Such an approach is highly inappropriate for irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland, where any loss would be immensely damaging to biodiversity and no adequate mitigation or compensation measures are possible.	DM/8.5 Managing Impacts upon Biodiversity and Geodiversity
396365	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	0	No	<p>Similar to the above policy (S/8.4) regarding the omission of the wording “protection, enhancement, creation and management” of bio &amp; geo assets (as per NPPF). This is particularly relevant for parts (a) and (b).</p> <p>Part (c) replace “where appropriate” to include stronger wording e.g “ unless shown to be inappropriate”</p> <p>The paragraph leading to parts (d-f) could also be more strongly worded by replacing the last sentence “ would be permitted where:-” with the sentence “ will not be permitted unless:-“</p> <p>Part d – re-worded to add strength i.e “there is evidence that the benefits of the development clearly outweigh any adverse impacts.....”</p> <p>Part e – include create and manage in the wording of this policy i.e “....would enhance, create and manage habitats on or off site as part of the proposals”</p> <p>Part f – include the following wording “applications are accompanied by appropriate ecological surveys that are carried out to industry guidelines, where there is reason to suspect presence of protected and priority species or habitats.....”</p>	DM/8.5 Managing Impacts upon Biodiversity and Geodiversity
510094	0	Natural England	LPCD6754	0	Policy DM/8.5 should be amended to ensure proposals which affect internationally designed sites are assessed under the Habitats Regulations. As worded the policy implies that developments that have adverse effects upon these sites would be permitted provided the benefits outweigh the harm, or there is adequate mitigation or compensation. Whilst this reflects the mitigation	DM/8.5 Managing Impacts upon Biodiversity and



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>hierarchy as set out in the NPPF, this approach does not apply to developments that adversely affect Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>Given the protection Natura 2000 sites are afforded, policy DM/8.5 should differentiate between proposals that affect them and those that affect nationally or locally designated sites.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Policy DM/8.5 should be amended as follows (additions in bold):</p> <p>All development proposals should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. protect the biodiversity and geodiversity value of land, protected species and minimise fragmentation of habitats; and</li> <li>b. maximise opportunities for restoration, enhancement and connection of natural habitats; and</li> <li>c. incorporate beneficial biodiversity and geodiversity conservation features, where appropriate.</li> </ul> <p>In accordance with European legislation and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, proposals which are likely to significantly affect the interest features of internationally designated sites will require an appropriate assessment. Proposals that adversely affect a site’s integrity can only proceed where there are no alternatives, imperative reasons of overriding public interest are proven, and the effects on the site are compensated.</p> <p>Proposals which are likely to significantly affect nationally or locally designated sites, protected species, or priority species and habitats (as identified in the BAP) will only be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. The benefits of the development in that location clearly outweigh any direct or indirect adverse impacts on the interest features or the wider ecological network.</li> </ul>	Geodiversity

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>e. Appropriate mitigation measures, reinstatement of features, or, as a last resort, compensation would enhance or recreate habitats on or off site form part of the proposals.</p> <p>f. Applications are accompanied by the appropriate surveys where there is reason to suspect the presence of protected and priority species or habitats planning to assess their presence and, if present, the proposal must be sensitive to, and make provision for, their needs, in accordance with the relevant protecting legislation.</p>	
805724	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Horton Estate	LPCD4066	0	<p>Horton Estate ask for clarification as to the extent of the Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA) around St Mary's headland. It is understood from reasoned justification para 8.25 that from the start of the St Mary's Island car park (presumably its southern end) and north around the headland will not be CCMA and therefore AS8.6 will not be applicable. Confirmation is requested that this is correct. This confirmation is requested in the context of the response made in relation to AS/4.7, that a well designed and appropriately sited cafe / information centre on St Mary's Headland could amongst other things enhance the area visually and improve its attractiveness to visitors. As such Horton Estate wish to understand the implications of the policy. Following on from the above, it is noted that the policy envisages some development on Tynemouth Longsands Beach. Horton Estate consider this supports their view that equally a well designed and appropriately sited development could also be accommodated on St Mary's headland.</p>	AS/8.6 Coastal Erosion
803900	LOCAL AUTHORITY	Northumberland County Council	LPCD2641	0	<p>Paragraph 8.25 The Council is supportive of the use of Northumberland and North Tyneside Shoreline Management Plan 2 as the primary source of evidence to identify policies to guide the management of Coastal Change Management Areas and would welcome the opportunity to continue duty to cooperate discussions in relation to the designation of Coastal Change Management Areas.</p>	AS/8.6 Coastal Erosion
510094	0	Natural England	LPCD6755	0	<p>This policy should ensure that any compensation habitat required as a result of the "Hold the Line" approach and subsequent loss of habitat through coastal squeeze, are not jeopardised. Natural England welcome the aspiration to maintain the beach and dunes at Longsands.</p>	AS/8.6 Coastal Erosion
805724	LANDOWNER /	Horton	LPCD4067	Yes	Horton Estate support the policy in seeking improvements to the cycle network	AS/8.7 Coastal

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	BUSINESS	Estate			along the coast. As stated in reasoned justification para 8.27 the cycle network amongst other things encourages tourism opportunities. A cafe / information centre on St Mary's headland as suggested in the response to AS/4.7 would be closely related to and support National Cycle Route 1.	Green Links
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6155	0	By the same token, it should be recognised that trees and woodland (paragraphs 8.29-8.32 refer) may be integral parts of, for example, conservation areas and historic parks and gardens etc, and not simply a 'backdrop' to those heritage assets.	8 Trees and Woodland
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6157	In part	Policy DM/8.8 In addition to supporting strategies and proposals which enhance the condition of trees and woodland, the policy should make clear that where unnecessary harm may be caused, development will be resisted. Possible impacts upon heritage assets should be assessed in terms of harm to their significance.	DM/8.8 Trees and Woodland
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6154	0	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.	DM/8.8 Trees and Woodland
591349	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4125	In part	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.	DM/8.8 Trees and Woodland
805405	NATIONAL ORGANISATION	The Woodland Trust	LPCD4096	In part	We agree with the general thrust of this policy which is the protection of woods and trees and a desire to plant more of them, particularly in association with new development. Paragraph 8.31 is a good summary of just some of the wide range of social, economic and environmental benefits which trees and woods can provide for local people in North Tyneside. We would like to see a more explicit statement in the policy of the need to give the strongest possible protection to irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees. Such habitats are irreplaceable, as we outlined in our comments in the Green Infrastructure section and are of immense conservation importance. We would like to see the plan give at least as strong protection to ancient woodland and ancient trees as that provided in the NPPF, where it states: Paragraph 118 bullet 5: planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient	DM/8.8 Trees and Woodland

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland. We would like to see ancient woods and ancient trees protected in all but the most exceptional circumstances. We would also like to see some quantifiable target included for the amount of new woodland which needs to be created or some objective measure applied to determine this. In the section on green infrastructure, we outlined the Woodland Trust's Access to Woodland Standard, which can be used for this purpose. We welcome the requirements for ten year management plans to be submitted for new planting schemes. For woodland planting, we would like to see encouragement given to the landowners to have their woods certified as being managed sustainably under a recognised certification scheme.	
396365	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	LPCD6739	0	There should be some reference to the use of locally native tree species in the policy (DM/8.8)	DM/8.8 Trees and Woodland
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6156	0	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 99. Should the allocation for site 99 go ahead, the Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek that the area developed be significantly reduced from that which is currently allocated.	AS/8.9 Key Green spaces in Wallsend and Willington Quay
591349	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4126	In part	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 99. Should the allocation for site 99 go ahead, the Northumberland Wildlife Trust would seek that the area developed be significantly reduced from that which is currently allocated.	AS/8.9 Key Green spaces in Wallsend and Willington Quay
510094	0	Natural England	LPCD6756	0	Natural England welcome and support the improvements to the wetland habitat proposed in this policy.	AS/8.9 Key Green spaces in Wallsend and Willington Quay
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6160	0	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 introduction of trees and other appropriate planting be specified as native species of local provenance.	AS/8.10 Movement and Green Links in Wallsend and

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
						Willington Quay
591349	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4127	In part	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 introduction of trees and other appropriate planting be specified as native species of local provenance.	AS/8.10 Movement and Green Links in Wallsend and Willington Quay
768554	GOVERNMENT ORGANSISATION	Highways Agency	LPCD6234	0	The Agency has no particular comment, but is generally supportive of seeking to improve the attractiveness and viability of sustainable transport and accessibility, which can help to reduce the need and desirability of the private car and deliver additional benefits to congestion.	AS/8.10 Movement and Green Links in Wallsend and Willington Quay
396365	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	LPCD6740	0	part (a) "introduction of native trees"	AS/8.10 Movement and Green Links in Wallsend and Willington Quay
396365	LOCAL AUTHORITY	0	LPCD6741	0	Should be some mention of SUDs (Sustainable Urban Drainage) somewhere in the policies regarding the reduction of flood risk.	8 Flood Risk
789566	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Environment Agency	LPCD5349	Yes	We support the inclusion of a flood risk and sustainable drainage policies. Policy DM/8.11 can be further strengthened through adding a requirement to avoid development within areas at risk of flooding. In particular we consider the policy should seek to steer development away from areas at risk of flooding, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. We recommend that this sequential approach to flood risk is included and the need for a Flood Risk Sequential Test be included for development in flood risk area. In addition we recommend that the policy should seek development should manage flood risk from all sources, taking into	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					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 consider that this policy should be amended to reflect issues outlined in North Tyneside's Water Cycle Study (WCS) and Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP).	
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6161	Yes	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.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
591349	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4128	In part	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.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4661	0	DM 8.11 should recognise information shown on maps published in the range of documents that form part of the consultation. PFP again raise concern about the accuracy of flood risk information presented for Smiths Dock.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
805405	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	The Woodland Trust	LPCD4115	No	We would like the policy to refer to the important role which greenspace and in particular trees and woods can play in helping to alleviate flood risk. Such measures can often be much cheaper and more long lasting than hard engineering solutions such as flood barriers, although often a combination of approaches may be most effective. The Environment Agency in the North East and Yorkshire ran a project recently called "Woods for Water" which produced some clear evidence of the benefits of trees and woods planted in appropriate locations in alleviating floods. The Red Rose Forest has done some important work showing the role of trees in reducing surface water run off. The Woodland Trust has produced a report <a href="http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/mediafile/100083927/Woodland-actions-for-biodiversity-and-their-role-in-water-management.pdf">http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/mediafile/100083927/Woodland-actions-for-biodiversity-and-their-role-in-water-management.pdf</a> which shows the benefits of trees and woods in improving water quality and slowing down certain types of floods.	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk
809792	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Ward Councillors	LPCD6618	No	As a general point. Before agreeing development sites should the council not be holding talks with Northumbria Water and trying to arrange for new and improved sewers for North Tyneside. Flooding seems to be a problem for many areas, and given many of the sewers are from the Victorian era when demand was less, surely many must now be reaching capacity	DM/8.11 Development and Flood Risk

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
						8.12
408348	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	The Coal Authority	LPCD4090	0	<p>Representation No.6 Site/Policy/Paragraph/Proposal “ Policy DM/8.13 (Minerals Proposals) Test of Soundness Positively Prepared- Yes Justified - Yes Effective - Yes Consistency to NPPF - Yes Legal &amp; Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - Yes Support “ The policy addresses all potential mineral proposals that may come forward, including energy and non-energy mineral development. The policy is considered to be sufficiently flexible to cater with any surface coal proposal that may come forward or with any new coal technology such as Coal Bed Methane or Underground Coal Gasification. The policy is considered by The Coal Authority to accord with national planning policy including that contained in paragraphs 147 and 149 of the NPPF relating to coal. The policy also 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. There are no current 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. Reason “ The policy accords with national planning policy including that contained in paragraphs 147 and 149 of the NPPF Representation No.7 Site/Policy/Paragraph/Proposal “ Policy DM/8.13 (Mineral Safeguarding “ General) Test of Soundness Positively Prepared- Yes Justified - Yes Effective - Yes Consistency to NPPF - Yes Legal &amp; Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - Yes Support “ The Council has taken a proactive stance towards the production of the mineral policy content which has included informal consultation regarding mineral safeguarding, mineral development, restoration and aftercare and development on unstable land in June 2011; and again in October 2011 we also had non-statutory consultation with North Tyneside Council in regarding the issue of mineral safeguarding and associated data/information. This is welcomed as an inclusive approach to plan making and is an example of positive plan preparation. The Local Plan approach towards mineral safeguarding has had regard to the advice in the 2011 BGS/The Coal Authority Practice Guide to Mineral Safeguarding in England. It looks to safeguard the geological resource through the use of a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA), before then moving on to set out a policy framework for implementation in criterion f. The policy also promotes the potential for prior</p>	DM/8.13 Minerals

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>extraction and the wording of the policy responds to comments made previously by The Coal Authority. Reason “ The defining of the MSA accords with paragraph 143 of the NPPF, the support for prior extraction of mineral resources also complies with paragraph 143 of the NPPF. The implementation criteria seek to achieve the objectives of the NPPF as set out in paragraph 145. The overall approach towards mineral safeguarding has also had due regard to the advice in the 2011 BGS/The Coal Authority Practice Guide to Mineral Safeguarding in England which provides the practice advice on this topic. Representation No.8 Site/Policy/Paragraph/Proposal “ Policy DM/8.13 (Mineral Safeguarding “ Policies Map) Test of Soundness Positively Prepared- Yes Justified - No Effective - No Consistency to NPPF - No Legal &amp; 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 necessary clarity to plan users. It is accepted that in paragraph 8.52 of the plan it does clearly state that: “œThe 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/8.13“™ 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 accords 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. Representation No.9 Site/Policy/Paragraph/Proposal “ Policy DM/8.13 (Mineral Safeguarding “ Thresholds) Test of Soundness Positively Prepared- Yes Justified - No Effective - No Consistency to NPPF - No Legal &amp; Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - Yes Comment/Objection “ The Coal Authority whilst not wanting to fundamentally object to the use of a 1 hectare site threshold above which the requirement to consider mineral sterilisation in the MSA will apply, must question the rationale behind its choice. We are aware that for example the neighbouring plan in South Tyneside has utilised a 1Ha threshold, however The Coal Authority only supported the use of that threshold based upon the circumstances in that area. In particular South Tyneside were able to</p>	



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>demonstrate a strong correlation between the sizes of the sites their plan allocated and of other likely windfall sites and the use of 1Ha as the threshold. Although policy DM8 and associated text in the adopted version of South Tyneside’s Development Management Policies DPD does not amplify the rationale behind their use of the 1Ha threshold, previous documents produced for consultation and the examination made the argument appropriately. Previous consultation on this issue, including the informal consultation has not contained the use of a threshold; this is therefore the first opportunity The Coal Authority has had to raise this matter with the Council. The North Tyneside Local Plan at present provides no justification behind the choice of the threshold. This needs to be addressed in order to demonstrate that the policy is justified and that it will still be effective in preventing unnecessary mineral sterilisation. The Coal Authority is of the view that such a justification is likely to be demonstrable and would be happy to discuss this matter further with the Council to overcome our concern. This could either be done through a brief background paper on mineral safeguarding or through some additional text in the policy justification. Paragraph 8.53 does not presently set out the rationale behind this threshold. Reason “ The lack of clear justification for the choice of threshold makes the policy unsound in that it is neither justified, nor effective and does not comply with paragraph 144 of the NPPF to not normally permit other development in MSAs. Paragraph 144 of the NPPF requires all minerals of local and national importance to be safeguarded from unnecessary sterilisation. Any exemption or threshold must therefore be adequately tested and be justified by evidence.</p>	
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6235	0	<p>The Agency is generally supportive of the policy and in particular Part e. of the criteria which seeks to safeguard the existing transport infrastructure at Howdon Wharf to allow for continued transfer and movement of marine aggregates. This should ensure that if working starts up again at the Wharf they can be continued with minimal transport impact. Additionally, any opportunities to implement future movements via waterborne modes or rail as alternatives to road transportation would be welcomed.</p>	DM/8.13 Minerals
803900	LOCAL AUTHORITY	Northumberland County Council	LPCD2644	0	<p>Policy DM/8.13: Minerals The Policy principles for minerals are generally supported. The policy provides strategic policy criteria for mineral extraction, site restoration, the safeguarding minerals resources and minerals related infrastructure and encourages opportunities for recycled materials. Howdon Wharf The supporting text in paragraphs 8.50 and 8.52 refers to Howdon Wharf. This supporting text should be strengthened to recognise the strategic</p>	DM/8.13 Minerals

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>importance of this site for the supply of aggregate minerals to both North Tyneside and the wider region, particularly given the limited aggregate resources in North Tyneside and there being no aggregate producing quarries in the borough. The important contribution of the wharfs in Tyne and Wear to the supply of sand and gravel is recognised in the Joint Local Aggregates Assessment for County Durham, Northumberland and Tyne and Wear. In addition it is also suggested that criterion (e) should be amended to include a reference to the role the Howdon Wharf site has, and will continue to have, in the importation of aggregate minerals. Safeguarding mineral resources. Paragraph 8.53. The clarity of the second sentence and its consistency with national planning policy would be improved by referring to ‘avoiding the unnecessary sterilisation of resources’. Safeguarding mineral infrastructure. Paragraph 8.52. It is considered that the wording ‘associated with the MSA’ should be deleted from the second sentence of paragraph 8.52 to improve clarity. The safeguarding of mineral infrastructure would normally be considered separately to the safeguarding of a mineral resource.</p>	
466900	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Mineral Products Association	LPCD5020	No	<p>We object to this policy as currently framed because it does not address the safeguarding requirements of aggregate mineral adequately and it does not address aggregates supply adequately. In this respect we are disappointed since our previous suggestions in 2010 for policy statements applicable to aggregates appear to have fallen on deaf ears. Whilst the policy is a laudable attempt to grapple with the subject of minerals there are several deficiencies with it that make it unsound. 1. We are pleased to see that the preamble of Policy DM/8.13 commits the authority to contributing to regional needs for minerals, but in the case of aggregates, does not say what that contribution is. We would suggest that the supporting text’s reference to the local apportionment (shared with other mpas in Tyne and Wear) in para 8.55 should be explicitly referred to in the policy. 2. In addition, the supporting text (para 8.55) does not appear to reflect the current situation in respect of need. Whilst reference is made to the draft conclusions reached in the Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) these are not the figures with which we have been supplied. The draft LAA recommends that further capacity for both sand and gravel and crushed rock will be needed in Tyne and Wear in the long term. Whilst sand and gravel reserves may be arithmetically sufficient for Tyne and Wear for the plan period, this is reliant on one site (we understand only benefitting from a resolution to grant planning permission subject to a legal agreement) producing basal Permian sand</p>	DM/8.13 Minerals

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>(Eppleton Quarry in Sunderland). The Draft LAA recognises that the remaining permitted reserves of sand may not be able to maintain a minimum seven year sand and gravel landbank throughout the period to 2030 and that the producing site does not have sufficient capacity to meet the recommended apportionment figure of 246,000 tpa. The LAA therefore advises that since much of the demand for sand and gravel arises within Tyne and Wear, it is appropriate for the sub region to supply as much of its needs as possible. Consequently, the LAA says that consideration will need to be given by Tyne and Wear authorities to identify additional areas for working through the preparation and review of their emerging Local Plans. 3. The draft LAA also advises that the apportionment for Tyne and Wear for 2013-2030 is 4.44 Mt for sand and gravel (crushed rock figures are inapplicable to North Tyneside which lacks the necessary resources to make a contribution). This is at odds with figures contained within the Draft Local Plan in paragraph 8.55. We suggest that the numerical data for apportionment needs to be included as part of the policy, using the best available figures from the LAA when it is endorsed by the AWP. 4. Due to the limited occurrence of aggregate minerals in the borough we accept that there is no need to make provision for a site allocation but to rely on a criteria based policy. 5. Turning to criterion c of the policy, we would judge that this is incapable of being implemented. Evidence at the national level suggests that secondary and recycled aggregates are being utilised to the fullest extent or nearly so. The proportion has grown from almost nothing in the 1990s to 28% of the market now. The available data from the Draft LAA shows that the major component of alternative aggregates sold in Tyne and Wear come from the recycling of construction and demolition wastes. Recycled aggregates benefit from two fiscal advantages over primary materials. They can avoid the Landfill Tax (usually paid by the waste producer) and are not subject to the Aggregates Levy. As such, they will always out perform primary materials of similar quality in price. The Draft LAA admits that reliable data on secondary and recycled aggregates is difficult to come by (para 4.50). The North East region already uses close to the national average of such materials at 27% of the total or 2Mt. This means that this criterion could only be relevant if secondary and recycled materials were being underutilised. In view of the fiscal advantages they enjoy and the evidence that usage is close to the national average, there is no evidence that that is the case. In addition, the lack of reliable information, especially at the mpa level, is likely to mean that the information needed to</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>satisfy the criterion will not exist. The way national policy requires how local apportionments are calculated involves top-slicing alternative materials from overall expected demand and then deriving apportionments of primary land won materials to make up the difference. Given this, any requirement of applicants to demonstrate that alternative materials cannot supply the demand is otiose since any proposal that can demonstrate a need for primary aggregate that contributes to the local apportionment has by definition already satisfied the test that alternative materials cannot supply the need. The criterion is superfluous and should be deleted. 6. The references to the MSA are not in accordance with national guidance on good practice from the BGS. National guidance emphasises that detailed boundaries of MSAs are based on geology, not the area of the local authority. The definition of the entire plan area as an MSA is therefore inappropriate for minerals other than surface coal. The BGS Aggregate Mineral Resources Map for the North East shows a small area of Basal Sand and Gravel resources outcropping in the Forest Hall area of the borough. Although it is a small area and is largely developed, it is nevertheless worthy of safeguarding as a separate area to surface coal. The disadvantage of the current approach is that the widespread occurrence of coal in the area will overshadow aggregates considerations, which is likely to be forgotten, especially in view of the statements in the policy and supporting text giving prominence to coal. There should therefore be a separate if limited MSA specifically for aggregates with advice on mineral assessments tailored to the needs of aggregates. This would be more in line with the national guidance of BGS which says in para 4.1.1, “The definition of MSA boundaries requires up-to-date, factual information on the physical location of mineral resources and should be based principally on the best available mineral resource information at the time MSAs are defined.” Thus the guidance specifically states that geology will determine MSA boundaries. Clearly, the MSA for North Tyneside has not been based on the geological occurrence of sand and gravel, and needs to be revised or supplemented as discussed above. 7. The content of what a Local Plan should contain in respect of an outlined approach to MSAs is clearly set out in the BGS guidance paragraphs 5.1.1 – 5.1.5. In order for the Local Plan to protect mineral resources it should state what will be protected (i.e. identify what the minerals are), where they can be found, (on what map), on what basis the MSA has been identified (what information has been used), how the MSA has been refined (with respect to geological information and consultation with the</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>industry), and whether it includes urban areas, environmental designations, buffers against indirect sterilisation, etc as recommended good practice. Without this information it will prove impossible to resist potentially sterilising development (either directly or indirectly), or even to identify whether any proposal threatens mineral resources in the first place. 8. Whilst Policy DM/8.13 and the supporting text have elements of this guidance, they fall short of being an effective approach at every stage of the plan making process, are thus unsound and we suggest alternative wording to the policy and text to rectify the deficiency. 9. The mineral safeguarding approach also ignores the important issue of sterilisation by proximal development which is covered by MPS Practice Guide para 32 and the BGS document para 2.3.2 and Figure 2. Consider a developer who shows that his land contains no sand and gravel. However, in processing his application the mpa miss the fact that his development sterilises adjacent mineral because neither they nor the developer have access to mapped data about where the mineral lies. 10. Furthermore, the BGS document also advises against the adoption of minimum sizes for exemption criteria and thresholds because even small developments may have significant effects on mineral sterilisation (para 5.2.8). Consider that even a single dwelling located in a prominent position in the middle of a resource area could sterilise the whole resource due to the need to protect it against the environmental effects of mineral working. This is why the national guidance strongly advises against the use of thresholds. The preferred method of filtering out irrelevant types of development is to use exemption criteria, which we would strongly advocate should be used instead.</p>	
466900	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Mineral Products Association	LPCD5022	No	<p>Proposed Changes Policy should be amended to read: Policy DM/8.13: Minerals Mineral resources and related infrastructure will be managed and safeguarded to meet current and future needs. A contribution to the region's supply needs will be made to ensure an adequate and steady supply of minerals in a way that supports the Borough's social, environmental and economic objectives. This will be achieved by a. Proposals for mineral extraction being assessed individually and cumulatively, and permitted where no adverse social, environmental and economic impacts would arise. b. If possible, an appropriate contribution will be made towards the Tyne and Wear sub regional aggregates apportionment of 4.44 Million tonnes of sand and gravel to 2030. This will require provision throughout the plan period of a minimum sub regional sand and gravel landbank equivalent to seven years' production at a rate of 0.246</p>	DM/8.13 Minerals

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>Million tonnes per annum. c. Worked land being subject to high standards of restoration and aftercare to ensure the most appropriate and beneficial use, at the earliest opportunity. d. Encouraging temporary material-recycling facilities on the sites of major demolition or construction projects and provision of permanent recycling plants for construction and demolition waste in appropriate locations. e. Safeguarding the existing transport and processing infrastructure at Howdon Wharf to allow for the continued transfer and movement of marine aggregates. f. 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 and basal sand and gravel resources in the plan area based on the broad areas shown on the Key Diagram. The Mineral Safeguarding Areas have been defined for each economically important mineral using the best available geological information, and include environmental designations, urban areas, and buffer zones to safeguard against sterilisation by proximal development. Planning permission will not be granted for any form of development within a Mineral Safeguarding Area that is incompatible with safeguarding the mineral unless:                       • the applicant can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the mineral concerned is no longer of any value or potential value; or                       • the mineral can be extracted satisfactorily prior to the incompatible development taking place; or                       • the incompatible development is of a temporary nature and can be completed and the site restored to a condition that does not inhibit extraction within the timescale that the mineral is likely to be needed; or                       • there is an overriding need for the incompatible development; or                       • it constitutes exempt development, namely householder applications; changes of use; development already allocated in a statutory plan; infilling in existing built up areas.</p>	
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6164	Yes	The Northumberland Wildlife Trust is in support of point a; that any mineral extraction would only be permitted where there is no adverse environmental impact.	DM/8.13 Minerals
591349	OTHER/LOCAL ORGANISATION	northumberland wildlife trust	LPCD4129	In part	The Northumberland Wildlife Trust is in support of point a; that any mineral extraction would only be permitted where there is no adverse environmental impact.	DM/8.13 Minerals

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
408348	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	The Coal Authority	LPCD4093	0	<p>Site/Policy/Paragraph/Proposal                      Policy DM/8.14 (Contaminated and Unstable Land) Test of Soundness                      Positively Prepared- Yes                      Justified - Yes                      Effective - Yes                      Consistency to NPPF - Yes                      Legal &amp; Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate - Yes</p> <p>Support</p> <p>Policy DM/8.14 now addresses the policy omission in relation to unstable land that was in previous consultation versions.</p> <p>The policy as written 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</p>	DM/8.14 Contaminated and Unstable Land
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6236	0	<p>The Agency has not particular concerns with this policy, however it should be noted that, in accordance with Circular 02/13, the Agency will require Transport Assessments prepared by developers to be comprehensive enough to establish the likely environmental impacts, in relation to air quality, light pollution and noise, where relevant, and to identify the measures to mitigate these impacts. It should also be noted that there may be development proposals that, whilst not within the statutory requirement for a local planning authority to consult the Agency, have the potential for direct or indirect physical impact on the SRN, or put its users at risk. Developers and local authorities are therefore encouraged to identify such potential risks and discuss these with the Agency at the earliest opportunity, to help reduce delay or risk to the delivery of the proposal.</p>	DM/8.15 Pollution

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
812201	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	LPCD6742	Yes	<p>When I met with the team in August I made a number of comments regarding in particular;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Policy BE 1: Sustainable Design and Construction [Re-numbered to DM/9.1]</li> <li>•Policy INF 4: Renewable Energy and Low-Carbon Technologies</li> </ul> <p>I asked that the language be changed to reflect a more positive approach to what is expected / encouraged in these areas, as opposed to reasons why, for example, renewable energy applications would be rejected.</p> <p>Upon reviewing these sections again I am happy with the content and thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have no further comments to make.</p>	DM/9.1 Sustainable Design and Construction
812199	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	LPCD6744	0	<p>.6 p109 Reference only to Building for Life 12, under Street and Home 12 the wording External storage and amenity space, Is there adequate storage space for bins and recycling as well as vehicles and cycles?</p> <p>This doesn't reflect the potential for innovation in this area. There is scope for looking at different systems, such as communal arrangements, using underground bins e.g. Tower Hamlets and vacuum systems, e.g. Malmo, Wembley City (Couple of examples attached). Keen to see if they could be applied to the affordable homes proposals.</p>	9 High Quality Design
755686	LOCAL ORGANISATION/ OTHER	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4606	In part	<p>Whilst the HBF is supportive of BfL12, and many developers conform to its principles, the Council should not attempt to make a standard developed by the industry a mandatory requirement of all developments. It is recommended that the policy be amended so that it reads "Residential developments are encouraged to demonstrate that they have successfully addressed Building for Life 12 criteria. [delete: "of 10 units or more" and "required"]</p>	DM/9.2 Design of Development
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6664	In part	<p>The Trust are broadly supportive of the Policy as, in accordance with the NPPF, it strives for high quality design. However, we note that the Government has recently consulted on changes to the delivery of housing standards. Policy DM/9.2 will, therefore, need to be kept under constant review. Further, the NPPF paragraph 173 requires plans to be deliverable and achievable through considering whether policies affect the ability of schemes to be developed viably. Further, we question the threshold of 10 units and suggest this should be increased to 15 units to align with affordable housing requirements. Accordingly,</p>	DM/9.2 Design of Development



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					the Policy should be more flexibly worded to read: Development should seek to demonstrates high and consistent design standards.Residential developments of 15 units or more or 0.5ha sites are encouraged to demonstrate that they meet adopted nationally described standards.	
510094	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Natural England	LPCD6757	0	In accordance with paragraph 118, policy DM/9.2 should also encourage applications to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments.	DM/9.2 Design of Development
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6162	In part	Policy DM/9.3 in some cases the building being extended will be a heritage asset, whether designated or otherwise. Where this is the case, it is important for an assessment of acceptability to weigh any possible harm to the significance of that asset against the public benefits it might bring “ the assumption being that harm to the asset that cannot be outweighed by necessary public benefits which cannot be met in any other way would be resisted.	DM/9.3 Extending Existing Buildings
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6666	In part	The Trust are broadly supportive of Policy DM/9.3 regarding extensions to existing buildings. However, the NPPF states at paragraph 60 that: Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes Further, some extensions to existing buildings are not attached to the main frontage of a building and are to house back of house functions. It would not in those cases be appropriate to design a high quality development, particularly if the proposal does not have a significant effect on the street scene or the host building. In this context, The Trust seek minor amendments to Policy DM/9.3 as follows: Extensions should where appropriate seek to compliment the form and character of the original building. The scale of an extension and its position should where necessary emphasise a subservience to the main building. This could involve	DM/9.3 Extending Existing Buildings
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6668	In part	Similarly, the Trust welcome Policy S/9.4 which seeks to improve the attractiveness and image of North Tyneside, however suggest that the Policy should be more flexibly worded as follows: To ensure continued improvement in the attractiveness and image of North Tyneside high standards of design will be ought In order to improve the image of the Borough proposals on these sites should seek to demonstrate“	S/9.4 Improving Image
396269	GOVERNMENT	English	LPCD6165	0	Paragraphs 9.10-9.15 deal with North Shields Town Centre. Apart from the	9 Image and

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	AGENCY	Heritage			preparation of a shop front design guide, policy focuses on public realm. We are advised, however, that the area is not reaching its full potential and that Northumberland Square has lost some of its historic significance. This being the case, this would seem to be the place within the Plan to introduce positive measures to tackle heritage and townscape issues in a more holistic way, including heritage at risk, both fabric and use.	Public Realm
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6166	0	Paragraphs 9.18-9.21 deal with public realm in Wallsend, yet it is clear that other issues (again to do with fabric and occupancy) beset it too. Here, too, is an opportunity to introduce a more holistic set of positive measures to tackle these issues.	9 Image and Public Realm
						9.5
						9.6
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6237	0	The Agency has no particular comment but is generally supportive of the focus on improving High Street East and High Street West for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users.	AS/9.7 Wallsend: High Street Improvements
						9.8
804019	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Owen Pugh Ltd	LPCD2627	In part	Relationship between Policy AS/9.9 Opportunity Sites in the North West and potential development sites. Policy AS/9.9 Opportunity Sites in the North West highlights a number of vacant and underused sites within the North West of North Tyneside (including Dudley) where development or investment could bring sites into suitable, beneficial use and contribute to improving the environment and image of communities within the area. Fairhurst are interested to see how the various opportunity sites policies will fit together with the housing site selection process. However, Fairhurst wish to note that simply because the Grieves Row site is not currently vacant or underused does not mean that it is not an opportunity site or should be rejected. As confirmed above, Owen Pugh, has indicated that it is their intention that the site will be redeveloped for housing in the future. Fairhurst recommend that, in order to be found sound, the Local Plan should respond to this and facilitate the	AS/9.9 Opportunity Sites in the North West

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					redevelopment of the site in a planned manner. Fairhurst recommend that the Local Plan's development framework for Dudley should take a comprehensive approach to available, suitable and deliverable development sites within Dudley, including Grieves Row.	
768554		0 Highways Agency	LPCD6238	0	At this stage, the Agency is not currently in a position to determine whether these sites will have any detrimental implications for the operation or safety of the network until a decision has been made on the final quantum and distribution of development within the Plan. As and when the final distribution and quantum of development has been decided, the Agency will be able to provide further detailed comment on these opportunity sites.	AS/9.9 Opportunity Sites in the North West
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6169	Yes	Policy S/9.10 - English Heritage welcomes a strategic policy on the historic environment.	S/9.10 Heritage Assets
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3138	0	Section 9.37 should mention both designated and undesignated heritage assets. I would advise against the use of the words 'Christian past'. Use 'early medieval and medieval origins' instead. Many of the villages have medieval origins including Earsdon, Monkseaton, Backworth, Wallsend, Burradon, Whitley Bay, Killingworth, Longbenton, Murton, Preston, Chirton, Willington. I recommend the word "old" is replaced with ancient. More recent buildings include 19th and 20th century. I don't think this section is very well written. It could do with being reworded. Section 9.38 Hadrian's Wall is part of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire WHS. The WHS only formally includes the scheduled sections, but all lie within the buffer zone. See the Hadrian's Wall management plan 2008-2014 for more info or contact Mike Collins, English Heritage's Hadrian's Wall Archaeologist <a href="mailto:mike.collins@english-heritage.org.uk">mike.collins@english-heritage.org.uk</a> The 8 SAM include Hadrian's Wall, they are not additional to the 8 - Burradon Tower, Burradon enclosure, West Backworth deserted medieval village, Tynemouth Priory/Castle, Clifford's Fort, Holy Cross Church, Segedunum Fort, one section of Hadrian's Wall (in two pieces) You need to mention undesignated heritage assets in here - the Local List is undesignated. Archaeological remains need to be mentioned and the HER. Heritage assets are not just buildings. S/9.10 Heritage Assets (f) the Historic Environment Record is another important example of evidence base	S/9.10 Heritage Assets
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4663	0	PfP support the need to fully consider the impact of new development on Heritage Assets but it is essential that it is clear how the impact is assessed and	DM/9.11 Protection,

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					when. Policy DM 9.11 seems to introduce a new method of assessment titled 'heritage impact assessment'. Further guidance is needed in relation to the approach proposed as it would seem sensible to follow Nationally recognised methodologies in Heritage Statements.	Preservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6170	In part	Policy DM/9.11 -“ where a development would cause harm to the significance of a heritage asset, it is necessary for it to achieve wider public benefits "that are necessary and cannot be met in any other way."	DM/9.11 Protection, Preservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3139	0	DM/9.11 Protection, Preservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets - this section assumes that all heritage assets are buildings. I see that you have a separate archaeology section. It also needs to address buried archaeological remains which are a material consideration in the planning process . Developments which may harm archaeological features will require an archaeological desk based assessment and evaluation report with their planning application. Historic buildings which are to be affected by development will require archaeological building recording before development commences. Where permission is granted for a development which will affect archaeological remains full archaeological excavation will be required. I am pleased to see reference to the HER in here. 9.47 Heritage assets, both designated and not (as defined in the NPPF) should say 'non-designated' rather than 'not'	DM/9.11 Protection, Preservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6177	In part	Policy DM/9.12 - findings should be published "within an agreed timescale."	DM/9.12 Archaeological Heritage
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3140	0	Archaeological Heritage - I am pleased to see a section on archaeology, however the NPPF does not differentiate between buildings and archaeological sites. Buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas and landscapes are all heritage assets. I therefore wonder if the section on heritage assets shouldn't cover buildings, parks and archaeology? Rather than having a separate archaeology section. This section should mention the HER as that is where heritage assets are recorded. 9.53 should not single out three of the SAMs as most notable, as all 8 have equal protection and importance. You should either list all 8 SAMs or none of them by	DM/9.12 Archaeological Heritage

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					name. Hadrian's Wall can be singled out as this is a WHS as well as a SAM. 9.54 should mention that these undesignated sites are listed in the HER. Spelling of medieval DM/9.12 should say a programme of archaeological works. Will be required to be completed (not just the programme submitted) in accordance with a specification agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Glad to see the inclusion of publication here. I presume that English Heritage has commented on the sections of Hadrian's Wall?	
806149	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	0	LPCD4315	No	The Council is proposing a Conservation Area in Wallsend Town Centre as shown in Map 11. NRR 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. We have not been able to find any evidence to support the designation. NRR recommend that the Forum Shopping Centre is excluded from the proposed Conservation Area boundary.	AS/9.13 Town Centre Conservation Area
805069	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	LPCD3128	0	I don't think section 9.66 has been worded very well: 9.66 Segedunum Fort, Baths and Museum is already an important attraction for Wallsend. The Hadrian Cycleway passes close and for those following the entire route of the cycleway the Fort is amongst the first, or last, major Roman archaeology they would come across. The North Tyneside Tourism Strategy 2007-2012 also encourages a Walk the Wall initiative that the policies of the Local Plan are supportive of. It should say the first or last major Roman archaeological site they would come across. [archaeology is the study of the remains, not the remains themselves]	AS/9.14 Wallsend: Segedunum Roman Fort and Hadrian's Wall WHS
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6181	In part	Policy AS/9.15 - hopefully, the Council would support the retention "and improvement", of the Spanish City site.	AS/9.15 The Spanish City
						9.16
						9.17
						9.18

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
587121	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Nexus	LPCD2428	0	We feel that this section could be strengthened by specific mention of other potential funding streams to support new infrastructure, such as LEP funding, Tax Increment Funding (TIF) / "land value uplift" etc, or any new methods permitted by national legislation.	10 General and Funding
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6184	0	English Heritage welcomes recognition that the historic environment is a legitimate recipient of Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 monies where heritage assets would be impacted upon by development.	10 General and Funding
807164	REGIONAL	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4907	0	NWL support the Council's recognition in paragraph 10.4 that the provision of infrastructure is of great importance to the delivery of the plan's objectives. The identification of the need to address climate change issues through flood prevention is welcomed.	10 General and Funding
587121	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Nexus	LPCD2429	Yes	In the "General and Funding" section, we welcome in S10.1 the proposal for using developer funding to provide important and necessary infrastructure in the Borough, whether such need is immediately obvious or anticipated in the future. We would be happy to work with the Council to develop a Transport Masterplan to consider all potential developments, and ensure that transport is considered holistically rather than on a site-by-site basis.	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding
594611	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	National Grid	LPCD2618	0	See Attached PDF letter for response.	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4664	0	As previously stated the Smith's Dock development has already delivered significant contributions via Section 106 Agreements and the introduction of CIL and how it is implemented in relation to Smith's Dock must be carefully considered.	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding
396325	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4400	In part	NWL acknowledge that appropriate infrastructure is delivered in the right place and at the right time. However NWL suggest Policy S/10.1 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, being: " Necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms; " Directly related to the development; and " Fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development.	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4827	0	Our Client acknowledges that appropriate infrastructure is delivered in the right place and at the right time. However our Client suggests that Policy S/10.1 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, being: ‘‘ Necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms; ‘‘ Directly related to the development; and ‘‘ Fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development.	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding
755686	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Home Builders Federation	LPCD4607	In part	Part ‘‘ 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. Improvements to deficiencies in existing infrastructure provision will therefore need to be dealt with through CIL contributions. 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
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD4936	0	Policy S/10.1- 'General Infrastructure and Funding' Our Client acknowledges that appropriate infrastructure is delivered in the right place and at the right time. However our Client suggests that Policy S/10.1 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, being: ‘‘ Necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms; ‘‘ Directly related to the development; and ‘‘ Fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development.	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding
808367	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Oliver	LPCD5712	No	The following paragraph sets out our client's (Mr G Oliver) response to this policy. It is important that the level at which CIL is set does not threaten the viability of development. However, it is difficult to provide detailed comment as to the introduction of CIL until specifics of CIL proposals are released. Our client therefore reserves the right to comment until further detail is made available.	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes	LPCD6035	0	‘‘The Council will ensure appropriate infrastructure is delivered in the right place and at the right time to: a. Remove any existing deficiencies in	S/10.1 General Infrastructure

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
		(Newcastle )			infrastructure provisionâ€™ We want the Council to note that improvements to deficiencies will need to be dealt with through CIL contributions, based on the Governmentâ€™s intention to scale back the use of S106 contributions from April 2015. In seeking to the maximise contribution from developers for infrastructure through Policy S/10.1 the Council must consider the impact this will have on the viability of sites and deliverability of housing targets. Para 173 NPPF: â€˜Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened The Council must ensure the development can still proceed in light of this policy. Perhaps the wording of the policy should reflect that the impact on viability will be considered and the contribution sought will not impact the deliverability of the site.	and Funding
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6239	0	The Agency is particularly supportive of this policy and the intentions to deliver infrastructure to remove deficiencies, mitigate the detrimental impacts of new development and to meet future infrastructure needs. The intentions to work with other providers, such as the Agency, is welcomed, as is the intention to utilising planning obligations through the use of a Community Infrastructure Levy to fund the delivery of future infrastructure needs. The Agency acknowledges that where it has been demonstrated that there is no prospect for sufficient private or developer funding, the Council will work with other organisations to investigate alternative funding schemes. The Agency is supportive of this approach and will work with the Council as and when required.	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD6588	In part	Our Client acknowledges that appropriate infrastructure is delivered in the right place and at the right time. However our Client suggests that Policy S/10.1 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, being: â€˜ Necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms; â€˜ Directly related to the development; and â€˜ Fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development.	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria	LPCD6670	No	The Trust consider the policy should align with the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 203-206 and paragraph 173 relating to viability. The Policy should be	S/10.1 General Infrastructure



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
		Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust			worded as follows: Delivery of essential infrastructure on or in close proximity to a site which is: - necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; - directly related to the development; and - fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development will be secured by a planning obligation. In instances where neither on-site nor off-site provision is appropriate the developer will be required to submit a robust justification demonstrating why in this instance a commuted payment is likely to be sought. In determining the nature and scale of any planning obligation, specific site conditions and other material considerations including viability will be taken into account. In cases where it is demonstrated by independent viability assessment that: a) The impact of planning obligations and abnormal development costs either individually or cumulatively would result in a proposed development becoming economically unviable; and b) A viable scheme cannot be achieved by amendments to the proposals which are consistent with other policies in this plan and the NPPF planning obligation requirements covering specific matters maybe reduced by agreement. By working with other providers, and in particular by maximising the contribution from developers to infrastructure through the use of Planning Obligations and as appropriate through the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). In determining whether to introduce a CIL and how this is applied, the Council will take into account the long term viability of different types of development over the whole Borough. In those circumstances where it can be demonstrated that there is no prospect of sufficient private or developer funding for necessary items or types of infrastructure, the Council will work together with other public sector organisations, within and beyond the borough, to maximise the amount and impact of the available public funding, including the use of combined and innovative funding schemes.	and Funding
809966	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Northern Gas	LPCD6657	In part	I have will assessed the revised 15-year requirement for additional capacity for 16,300 homes (new number) plus 180 hectares of office / light industrial and 33,000 m2 of retail (from your previous enquiry) and allocated 25% each at Killingworth, Wallsend, North Shields and Whitley Bay. Regarding our high pressure pipelines / pressure reduction sites, intermediate and medium pressure mains infrastructure we have sufficient capacity to accommodate this additional load. Depending on the specific nature of the growth there will undoubtedly be the need for new local infrastructure and possibly local reinforcement, but at a strategic level we are likely to be OK. Please note that	S/10.1 General Infrastructure and Funding

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					this is indicative only to assist in your preparation of the IDP and not an offer or guarantee that capacity is available – this will need to be assessed on an individual basis based on firm enquiries – but I hope that it assists in the development of your plan.	
808917	LAND DEVELOPER	Barratt Homes (Newcastle )	LPCD6036	0	BDW are supportive of this policy which demonstrates the Council’s commitment to ensuring development is viable and deliverability. The policy adequately addresses issues relating to circumstances where developers cannot make additional payments to prevent the stalling of development.	DM/10.2 Development Viability
810041	BUSINESS	Banks Property Ltd	LPCD6701	In part	Draft Policy DM/10.2 deals with development viability and sets out a positive approach to considering development proposals where they may not be financially capable of accommodating the full contributions required to ordinarily support the scheme. The principle of this approach is considered to be consistent with the Framework. However, it is considered that Part 'B' of the policy is unnecessary in the context of the Framework and is not prepared in the positive manner required by the Framework. Other policies of the plan sufficiently address the appropriateness and importance of development over the plan period and this statement within Policy DM/10.2 is not necessary.	DM/10.2 Development Viability
587121	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Nexus	LPCD2423	0	We welcome the support for public transport in the ‘Connectivity and Transport’ section of the Local Plan. We welcome the point in Para 10.18 about promoting ‘specific local measures to deliver improved priority and reliability for bus services’, which we assume refers to features such as ‘bus-only gates’ and the like. We ask for an indication that any such features will be installed using legal and/or physical methods which enforce their status. Apart from such provision in new developments, we ask that strong consideration also be given to enhancing bus accessibility in the major highway schemes specified elsewhere, including the A1058/A19 junction scheme. Overall, we would reiterate our view of the importance of promoting and providing improved public transport (and wider sustainable transport) in development and planning decisions.	10 Connectivity and Transport
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4665	0	As NTC are fully aware, river transport is a major benefit to this area of the Tyne but little recognition is provided in the consultation documents. Similarly PFP, in full consultation with NTC, undertook a detailed feasibility study into the	S/10.3 Transport

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					introduction of wider river transport. Pfp consider that NTC should recognise the importance that the River Tyne plays and how more use could be made.	
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6242	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the policy and its pursuit of encouraging a modal shift towards more sustainable modes of transport through creating more attractive alternative travel options via public transport, and seeking to provide safe, convenient and accessible routes for pedestrians, cyclists and other non-motorised modes of transport. The provisions in relation to Part 1) are therefore supported. With regards to Part 2) and the Road Network, the Agency welcomes that specific reference has been made to the improvements proposed on the A19(T) including: the A19 (T) / A1058 Silverlink Interchange and the A19 (T) / A1056 Killingworth Interchange, along with the inclusion of these schemes within the IDP. However, as has already been highlighted, the Agency is not currently in a position to confirm whether the schemes currently identified will be capable of supporting and addressing the impact of Plan's development aspirations as a whole, until a final decision has been made on the preferred allocations. At such time, the Agency will be able to assist with assessing the individual and cumulative impacts of the Plan's development sites and whether any further measures will be required. The Agency will therefore continue to liaise with the Council to ensure that this can be achieved at the earliest opportunity.	S/10.3 Transport
806138	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Nexus	LPCD4328	0	As part of its business Nexus need to keep their assets under review and in this respect they note the reference in criterion f to Benton Curve (south to west). It is not wholly clear from this policy or from the Proposals Map as to precisely which area this pertains albeit there is a reference in reasoned justification para 10.19 to "safeguarding Benton Curve (south and west) which will enable long term aspirations for a long term aspirations for a heavy rail link to Newcastle Airport to be realised". Nexus wish to confirm that this policy does not pertain in whole or part to potential development site 14: Land to the rear of Midhurst Road, Benton. The area is therefore no longer needed for operational reasons and should not be protected for current operations and connection onto the main line not being feasible or realistic proposition.	S/10.3 Transport
803900	LOCAL AUTHORITY	Northumberland County Council	LPCD2642	0	The Council is supportive of the proposal to ensure the retention and protection of essential infrastructure to facilitate the reintroduction of the Blyth and Tyne Railway. This too is an aspiration of Northumberland Council, and the policy should recognise the links between Northumberland and North Tyneside, in respect of the Ashington, Blyth and Tyne Railway line.	S/10.3 Transport

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
396324	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Newcastle Airport	LPCD3053	0	We welcome the retention of safeguarded land around the Benton Curve, for a potential heavy rail link to the Airport. This remains an aspiration for us, and while it is considered a longer term, strategic proposal, this land would be essential to achieving this. We also welcome the approach to be taken in ensuring that transport links to key locations, such as the Airport, will be strengthened, recognising the importance of good transport links in enabling economic development and more sustainable communities.	S/10.3 Transport
587121	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Nexus	LPCD2424	In part	Nexus are currently developing a Metro Strategy which considers potential route extensions. In Policies S10.3 and DM10.4, we welcome the Council's continued preservation of the former heavy rail corridor between Percy Main and Northumberland Park as a potential Metro corridor, and prohibition of development which would block access to it, in Policy S10.3 1(f). This link will also require access to be maintained to likely station sites south of Northumberland Park, as well as Metro connections at the southern and northern ends of this corridor. We have previously added this potential Metro extension into the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Policy S10.3 helpfully supports the enhancement of existing Metro stations and facilities, but consideration should also be given to the potential for new Metro stations on the existing network, where these are supported by developments of substantial size. This approach has already been successfully and positively exemplified by the Council in recent years by the construction of Northumberland Park station.	S/10.3 Transport
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6243	0	The Agency is particularly supportive of this policy and its intentions to improve accessibility and transport choice, by ensuring all new development is well served by an attractive choice of transport modes, including public transport footpaths and cycle routes. It is consider, when including this and the requirement of Part B for all major development proposals to be accompanied by a transport assessment and travel plan, along with the implementation of Policy S/10.3, it should help to deliver and encourage a modal shift towards more sustainable methods of transport, helping to reduce travel by car and ensure that the implications on transport infrastructure are appropriately considered as part of future development proposal.	DM/10.4 New Development and Transport
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS	LPCD6672	In part	The Trust are broadly supportive of Policy DM/10.4 however consider that it is too general and does not take into account the scale and type of development. Under the Policy as currently drafted, a small scale, minor extension or new development to accommodate plant equipment for example, would be subject	DM/10.4 New Development and Transport

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
		Foundation Trust			to the same requirements as a large scale residential development. The Trust therefore request that the wording of the Policy is amended as follows: "The Council and its partners will ensure that the transport requirements of new development, commensurate to the scale and type of development, are taken into account and that"	
587121	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Nexus	LPCD2427	In part	We note the proposals to install a pedestrianisation scheme in Whitley Bay town centre in Policy AS10.5, and while recognising the benefits to local retail vitality, would support the importance of ensuring that public transport routes are not unduly disturbed.	AS/10.5 Coastal Transport
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6187	In part	Policy AS/10.5 " criterion (f) should make overt reference to avoiding impacts upon the "historic" environment.	AS/10.5 Coastal Transport
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6244	0	The Agency has no particular comment, but is generally supportive of Parts a. and c. of the policy which seek to give greater priority and improve the environment for pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport, which should help to improve the reliability and desirability of sustainable transport and reduce the dependency on private car travel.	AS/10.5 Coastal Transport
805724	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Horton Estate	LPCD4068	In part	Horton Estate consider this policy needs to be more focused and in particular criterion f which states that 'if a car parking site is lost that serves the coast, then it will be replaced by another site (s) with the equivalent number of spaces, where there is an identified need, in a suitable coastal location that would cause no adverse impacts'. The policy and in particular criterion f is wide ranging and extends beyond Whitley Bay town centre and its immediate surroundings. Within these areas Horton Estate support the policy but wish to understand the implications of the policy in less urban locations for example at St Mary's headland. In this respect a portion of the existing car park might be a good site for a cafe / information centre and compensatory car parking might not be appropriate or desirable.	AS/10.5 Coastal Transport
587121	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Nexus	LPCD2425	Yes	We welcome proposals to maintain and improve public transport accessibility in policies AS10.6 and AS10.7, and will be happy to engage with the Council in this regard.	AS/10.6 Wallsend: Transport and Accessibility in the Town Centre

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6245	0	The Agency is supportive of the policy and the intentions to improve the user’s perceptions of the usability and safety of the public transport network around Wallsend. Paragraph 10.30 acknowledges the area’s existing public transport attributes and in particular the benefits of the Metro and frequency of bus services, and as such the Agency is therefore supportive of Parts b. and c. which seek to maintain and improve these provisions.	AS/10.6 Wallsend: Transport and Accessibility in the Town Centre
587121	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Nexus	LPCD2426	Yes	We welcome proposals to maintain and improve public transport accessibility in policies AS10.6 and AS10.7, and will be happy to engage with the Council in this regard.	AS/10.7 Sustainable transport and traffic management for the North West
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6246	0	The Agency is supportive of the policy and the acknowledgement in the supporting text of the importance of a good range of sustainable transport options within the area to help avoid a reliance on the private car due to the areas isolation. As such, the Agency is particularly supportive of Part a. which seeks to safeguard and improve the area’s bus service provision, and Parts b. and c. which seek to encourage active travel through walking and cycling, which should help to reduce an over reliance on the private car.	AS/10.7 Sustainable transport and traffic management for the North West
594611	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	National Grid	LPCD6646	0	Specific development proposals within North Tyneside Council are unlikely to have a significant effect upon National Grid’s gas and electricity transmission infrastructure. It is unlikely that any extra growth will create capacity issues for National Grid given the scale of these gas and electricity transmission networks. The existing networks should be able to cope with additional demands. The electricity distribution company in the area is Northern Power Grid and the gas distribution company is Northern Gas Networks. It will be these suppliers who should be contacted for further information regarding constraints and opportunities that the distribution networks may have on specific sites and growth in the area, and not the transmission network which operates at a much more strategic level. Contact details for these UK Power Networks can be found on the Energy Networks website: <a href="http://www.energynetworks.org">www.energynetworks.org</a> Planned Transmission Developments It may also be useful for you to note that proposed enhancements to the transmission network can be found through the following	10 Energy Production and Distribution

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					links: National Grid's Seven Year Statement sets out the proposed enhancements to the electricity transmission network and can be found at the following link: <a href="http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Electricity/SYS/">http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Electricity/SYS/</a> National Grid's Ten Year Statement sets out the proposed enhancements to the gas transmission network and can be found at the following link: <a href="http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Gas/TYS/">http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Gas/TYS/</a>	
812201	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	LPCD6743	Yes	When I met with the team in August I made a number of comments regarding in particular; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Policy BE 1: Sustainable Design and Construction [Re-numbered to DM/9.1]</li> <li>•Policy INF 4: Renewable Energy and Low-Carbon Technologies</li> </ul> I asked that the language be changed to reflect a more positive approach to what is expected / encouraged in these areas, as opposed to reasons why, for example, renewable energy applications would be rejected. Upon reviewing these sections again I am happy with the content and thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have no further comments to make.	DM/10.8 Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technologies
396306	LOCAL AUTHORITY	South Tyneside Council,	LPCD2497	0	We welcome the recognition at paragraph 10.46 that Northumbrian Water will invest in improvements to manage waste water and sewage capacity at the Howdon Sewage Treatment Works. We understand that their Jarrow Pre-Treatment Works, which feeds waste water and sewage across from the south of Tyne area to the Howdon plant, is also facing similar capacity issues such that these matters should be analysed and coordinated on a cross-boundary basis.	10 Water Management
812199	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	LPCD6747	0	P138 – typo in Water Management	10 Water Management
807164	Business	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4909	0	NWL welcomes the discussion around water management issues set out in paragraphs 10.44 to 10.46. The Council will be aware that the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to, "develop policies to manage flood risk from all sources". The risks of flooding from sewers are becoming more apparent. Flooding from sewers arises predominately from storm events that result in excessive surface run-off from existing built development entering the sewerage network. As a result, in instances where the network does not have adequate capacity to accommodate such events, waste water discharges from	S/10.9 : Water Supply

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					the network to surrounding land and occasionally property.	
807164	Business	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4915	0	It is important to note that flooding from sewers can occur in areas that are not at risk from flooding from conventional sources, and indeed affected areas can be located some distance from any storm events themselves. The plan sets out proposals for up to 12,000 new homes, 210ha of land for economic activity and more than 29,100sqm of retail floor space over the next 15 years. It is considered therefore, that in order to ensure the proposed new development is not at risk of flooding from all sources and indeed does not give rise to additional flood risk in itself, the supporting text should have regard to need to the manage flood risk from all potential sources, including flooding from sewers which is a significant additional source of risk within North Tyneside. The work we have carried out in assessing your SHLAA sites will assist you in understanding the sewerage network capacity issues associated with the development of these sites.	S/10.9 : Water Supply
807164	Business	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4922	0	NWL welcome policy S/10.9 regarding water supply. However, the policy in its current format only requires surface water run-off and SUDs where practicable and suitable for the development. It is considered that the policy should be amended to state that, where SuDS cannot be implemented clear justification should be provided outlining the reasons and demonstrating alternative sustainable approaches to managing surface or groundwater flooding. Where SuDS are provided arrangements must be put in place or their whole lifetime management and maintenance. The final sentence of this policy currently reads 'The priority is to reduce the amount of surface water entering the sewerage system to avoid unnecessary treatment'. We believe this could be strengthened as follows to read "The priority is to avoid, minimise and control surface water entering the sewerage system to reduce the risk of sewer flooding and to avoid the need for unnecessary treatment. This will also help by creating headroom within the sewerage network and at Howden Sewage Treatment Works (STW) to support future development.	S/10.9 : Water Supply
807164	Business	Northumbrian Water Ltd	0	0	This latter point is relevant to 10.46 which states that "To ensure there is capacity a1 Howden Sewage Treatment Works to support growth Northumbrian Water Ltd will invest in solutions to remove existing surface water from the public sewerage system ... " Whilst this is one key strand of our overall plan to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to support all of the housing growth across the Howden STW catchment, there are several others. To ensure that we have a consistent and agreed position on Howden STW we are working	S/10.9 : Water Supply



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					with all of those councils who utilise Howden STW to agree a Memorandum of Understanding. Gayle Wilson of Gateshead Council has kindly agreed to produce an initial draft which will be shared with neighbouring authorities as part of their duty to cooperate. The final sentence of 10.46 should be amended to reflect the need to avoid using public sewers wherever possible for the disposal of surface water and if a sewer connection is the only option there is a need to minimise and control flows.	
789566	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Environment Agency	LPCD5364	Yes	As outlined in 10.46 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. Mine water levels at Algernon (Cobalt Business Park) are currently actively controlled and managed by the Coal Authority. Therefore groundwater levels in this area do not reflect the 'natural' conditions and may change in the future if pumping stops to allow the mine water to rise to its natural levels. Rising levels can lead to mine water break outs at the surface. Geology maps show the area is covered by glacial till or boulder clay which is mainly low permeable till/ clay with sand and gravel layers/ lenses. This material may not be suitable material for soakaways due to its inability to percolate liquid discharges. A number of recent planning applications have proposed direct discharges of surface water to the bedrock. We consider that this do not provide a sustainable, long term solution due to rising groundwater levels reducing the storage capacity which may lead to groundwater flooding elsewhere. We would welcome further discussion regarding how the two policies (8.11 and 10.10 can reflect these issues.	DM/10.10 : Sustainable Drainage
807164	LANDOWNER/BUSI	Northumbri	LPCD4983	0	Policy DM/10.10 is supported. The wording of the first paragraph should be	DM/10.10 :

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
	NESS	an Water Ltd			amended to address the run-off rates for greenfield and brownfield sites discussed in DM/8.11 above. It is considered that simply not exceeding pre-development levels is insufficient and the plan should seek to reduce run-off in all new developments. Surface water runoff rates resulting from the development of a brownfield site, should be limited to a maximum of 50% of the flows discharging immediately prior to development, and for development on greenfield sites should be limited to the equivalent run-off rate. This may have to be reviewed if the SuDS National Standards are adopted and development plan policy would need to be brought into line with these stricter guidelines. As discussed in DM/8.11 above NWL would urge the Council to consider this greater reduction in surface water run-off within at least the Borough's 'critical drainage areas'. Ensuring that new development is not at risk of flooding and does not give rise to flooding elsewhere is a fundamental planning consideration on a par with considerations such as securing a safe access. Compliance with the appropriate policies or guidelines controlling surface water run-off guidelines should be treated as a non-negotiable requirement and not something that is discretionary, can be set aside for viability reasons, or traded-off against other planning objectives. Any development plan policy will need to be carefully worded to reflect this status particularly as the current draft of the National SuDS Guidance could allow developers to avoid the use of SuDS or the provision of storage on viability grounds.	Sustainable Drainage
803900	LOCAL AUTHORITY	Northumberland County Council	LPCD2643	0	Howdon Sewerage Treatment Works – paragraph 10.46 Whilst the paragraph recognises there will be the need for NWL to invest in solutions to remove existing surface water from the sewerage system, it would be beneficial for the paragraph to also recognise that there is on-going joint work between the Council, other local authorities, NWL and the Environment Agency to reduce the amount of surface water in new developments and separate it from the sewerage system to ensure that waste water from future new developments can be accommodated at the treatment works.	DM/10.10 : Sustainable Drainage
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6203	0	Paragraphs 10.47-10.48 deal with waste management. Observations made earlier (LPCD6159) in respect of the prudent use of existing built fabric/buildings is relevant here.	10 Waste Management
812199	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	LPCD6745	0	10.51 The North Tyneside Waste Management Strategy 2013-2030, Changing our thinking ... away from rubbish and towards a resource, provides the local framework for managing municipal waste and identifies a number of key	10 Waste Management

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>objectives to improve the service. Historically progress has been good with significantly enhanced recycling rates from just over 10% in 2003/4 to over 36% in 2013/14. Progress in reversing waste production has also been good with household waste levels falling to 90,088 tonnes in 2012/13 compared with a peak of 107,500 tonnes in 2007. In addition a range of innovative initiatives have reduced the amount of waste sent to landfill, less than 19% in 2012/13. Although non-recycled waste continues to be sent to landfill, this will be below 10% in 2013/14.</p> <p>10.52 typo – jointly</p> <p>10.53 – landfill at Path Head, Blaydon</p> <p>10.55 The current waste disposal contract with SITA runs until 31st March 2022. What is meant by a major new treatment facility within North Tyneside? With the North Tyneside and Newcastle waste contracts now being more aligned there is the potential for a joint procurement – this would be for the treatment of 160,000 tonnes. Don't know if we can exclude the option of having a facility of this size within the borough, would it be considered major?</p> <p>In North Tyneside Waste Management Strategy 2013-2030, Changing our thinking ... away from rubbish and towards a resource, the strategic aims include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will rethink our collection and storage methods for the long term</li> </ul>	
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6190	In part	Policy AS/10.11 " policy should make overt reference to avoiding impacts upon the "historic" environment.	S/10.11 Waste Management
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6248	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the policy and the requirement for sites to be located in sustainable locations that have no adverse impact on people, biodiversity and the environment. The sequential priorities proposed focusing on co-location of facilities, employment sites and sustainable previously developed land, are also supported.	S/10.11 Waste Management
803900	LOCAL AUTHORITY	Northumberland County Council	LPCD2645	0	Policy S/10.11 Location of new or enhanced waste management facilities The policy criteria to guide the location of new or enhanced waste management facilities in North Tyneside in Policy S/10.11 are supported. Policy S/10.11 Tonnages of waste requiring management Policy S/10.11 and the supporting text do not identify the tonnages of municipal and commercial and industrial waste requiring management in North Tyneside over the plan period and should be amended to incorporate this. This is a requirement of national planning policy and is identified in paragraph 3 of the draft updated national planning	S/10.11 Waste Management

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					policy for sustainable waste management, which was published for consultation in July 2013. It is however noted that the supporting text refers to the current arisings and the Waste Arisings and Waste Management Capacity Study, which was jointly undertaken by North Tyneside Council along with Northumberland County Council, Durham County Council and the remaining four Tyne and Wear councils (Gateshead, Newcastle, South Tyneside and Sunderland). The key evidence base provided in this report should be reflected more explicitly in Policy S.10/11 and the supporting text. This should include the key assumptions regarding the wastes that will not be managed outside the borough.	
803900	LOCAL AUTHORITY	Northumberland County Council	LPCD2646	0	Paragraph 10.53 The Seghill Landfill Site in Northumberland has now closed and therefore has no available capacity to manage future waste arisings from North Tyneside. The paragraph should be amended accordingly.	S/10.11 Waste Management
764389	LOCAL AUTHORITY	Cumbria County Council	LPCD2616	In part	I am responding to your consultation, on behalf of the Minerals & Waste Planning Policy Team at Cumbria County Council. This is an officer level response. With regard to minerals, we consider your draft Plan to be sound. In general, your waste policies and text are also sound, but you do not mention radioactive waste management at all. You mention in paragraph 10.60, that there is one major hospital in your Local Authority area. It is likely that there would be some Very Low Level radioactive waste from the hospital, as radioactive substances, such as barium, are often used in several different departments (e.g. oncology). A statement on whether you have such waste arisings, plus the current and intended future disposal methods, would be welcome. If there are any particular issues that you wish to discuss, especially with regard to imports and exports of waste and/or minerals between our two authority areas, please contact this office.	S/10.11 Waste Management
812199	LOCAL AUTHORITY	North Tyneside Council	LPCD6746	0	Again the waste Strategy includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will ensure disposal points and treatment facilities are in close proximity whenever possible</li> </ul> Should this be one of the guiding principles?	S/10.11 Waste Management
441647	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	SITA UK Ltd	LPCD4390	0	Moving on to the policies which aim to deliver this objective, while SITA UK understands the justification for the second section of Policy S/10.11, "Waste Management" (as follows), in order to protect amenity, we do have some concerns about the drafting of the text. Planning Policy Statement 10, "Planning for Sustainable Waste Management" and the draft Updated National Waste Planning Policy: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management	S/10.11 Waste Management

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>(July 2013) both contain locational criteria to be taken into account in the siting of waste facilities and the Local Plan policy should reflect that criteria. Sites will be located in sustainable locations that have no adverse impact on people, biodiversity and the environment, appropriate to the proposed waste management use and its operational characteristics, in accordance with the following sequential priorities: a. Employment sites where co-location with existing waste management processes is possible without detriment to residential amenity; b. Employment sites suitable for Use Classes B2 and B8; c. Sustainable locations within vacant previously developed land. Further to the above, it may not be possible to locate facilities so that they have no adverse impact on people, biodiversity and the environment or without detriment to residential amenity. In order to ensure that developments remain deliverable in accordance with the policy, SITA UK consider that the text should be amended to reflect that any impacts will need to be assessed and effective mitigation provided. This would accord with the draft Updated National Waste Planning Policy: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (July 2013) which only outlines that such factors should be considered (page 9).</p>	
803900	LOCAL AUTHORITY	Northumbria County Council	LPCD2648	0	<p>In safeguarding existing waste facilities, Policy DM/10.12 also needs to consider the impact that incompatible development in close proximity to an existing waste site would have on the current and future operation of that site. Additional criteria should be added to Policy DM/10.12 to recognise this issue.</p>	DM/10.12 Protection of Waste Facilities
441647	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	SITA UK Ltd	LPCD4391	In part	<p>SITA UK supports the aim of Policy DM/10.12, Protection of Waste Facilities, however, would like to suggest that additional text is included to protect operational waste management assets from neighbouring development which may constrain existing processes. Certain uses of land, particularly residential, can significantly constrain the efficiency of existing, neighbouring waste management or industrial operations. SITA UK own a Waste Transfer Station at Benton Square Industrial Estate, directly adjacent to Potential Development Site 25: Killingworth Moor C. While we have no objection in principle to the site being designated or developed for residential use, it is essential that the new development takes account of the existing processes undertaken and provides appropriate mitigation or a buffer as appropriate. SITA UK would like to suggest a further element to Policy DM/10.12, Protection of Waste Facilities as follows: Development adjacent to existing or allocated waste management sites will only be permitted where the proposed</p>	DM/10.12 Protection of Waste Facilities

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>use will not place constraints on the continued operation of those facilities.â€                      The second paragraph of Policy DM/10.12 states â€œwhere an existing facility has had an adverse effect on its neighbourhood by virtue of visual impact or other nuisance, extension or intensification of that use will only be permitted where proposals can be shown to result in a significant reduction in that nuisanceâ€. SITA UK would like to suggest that this paragraph is removed or significantly amended, for several reasons: â€¢ The paragraph does not seem to be consistent with the policy title of â€˜Protection of Waste Facilitiesâ€™ and appears to place impose constraint rather than protection; â€¢ The term â€œadverse effectâ€, is quite open and subjective in this context and it, therefore, leaves a lot of uncertainty for the local community and developers; â€¢ There appears to be no justification for this paragraph to be related to only to waste management facilities; and â€¢ This policy requiring reduction of â€˜nuisanceâ€™ would constrain an extension or intensification which is demonstrated to have no additional significant impacts and would overlap with other regimes for the control of nuisance and pollution. With regard to the accompanying text, paragraph 10.51 notes that â€œnon-recycled waste continues to be sent to landfillâ€. This statement is correct, but as noted in 10.53 most of the municipal residual waste arising in North Tyneside is taken to the energy from waste plant on Teesside and that could also be acknowledged within this paragraph to provide a fair representation. Paragraph 10.53 makes reference to â€œa waste energy plantâ€ and SITA UK would like to suggest that this is amended to â€˜energy from waste plantâ€™ or â€˜energy recovery plantâ€™ in order to be consistent with commonly used terminology. Furthermore, the paragraph states that waste is taken to landfill at Seghill, however, Seghill landfill closed to waste in December 2011. Currently, when the energy from waste plant is not operational, municipal waste from North Tyneside is taken to Path Head landfill in Gateshead but it may be better to not make reference to any specific landfill bearing in mind the potential lifespan of the Local Plan. Paragraph 10.54 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. The Urban Mines study states at page vii â€œmodelling suggests that loss of capacity at Houghton is likely to have a significant impact on regional residual waste</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					capacity, resulting in a landfill capacity shortfall by 2018 and overall capacity shortfall by 2021, unless increased recycling rates are delivered. It is appreciated that the low level scheme at Houghton Landfill will still require the importation of 750,000 m3 of inert waste over 5 years from 28.10.13, however, this remains a significant shortfall from the 2,500,000 void which could have been filled up to 2029 if the landfill extension was pursued. Finally, paragraph 10.55 makes reference to the current contract with SITA but for the general public this could be expanded to offer an explanation of the relevance of both the contract and the role of SITA UK in delivering it.	
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6222	In part	Policy S/10.13 in giving consideration to the location and enhancement of community infrastructure, regard should be had to any heritage value it might possess.	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6250	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the policy and the aim to deliver local cultural activities and community facilities in locations within the neighbourhoods that they serve. In particular services and facilities, which are sustainably accessible, required to serve an identified need and are of a scale that is commensurate with the community within which it serves is supported.	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6676	No	The Trust strongly suggest that it would be more effective to have a stand-alone policy that relates solely to the Trust's land and operations. Further, as currently worded, the second part of Policy S/10.13 would significantly constrain the Trust's ability to dispose of surplus land and reinvest into healthcare. As confirmed earlier, the Trust have identified land for housing through a Government initiative to specifically dispose of surplus public sector land. Under the terms of the Policy as currently drafted, the Council would resist the redevelopment of Ash Court and Tynemouth Court for housing and would seek priority to be given to their re-use as community facilities. Further, the Council would require both sites to be marketed for a period of 6 weeks for community uses. This is in contrast to the Trust's clear intentions to dispose of these sites for housing to maximise their land value and invest the capital receipt in healthcare. The Trust therefore suggest that should the Council wish to retain this policy to guide the development of other community facilities, the policy should expressly confirm the policy does not relate to the Trust's healthcare facilities. The Trust suggest the following wording: The Council and its partners will ensure that local cultural activities and community facilities (excluding those provided by Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundations Trust are located in the	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					neighbourhoods that they serve'.. Where land or buildings used as community facilities are deemed surplus to requirements, excluding land owned by Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, priority should'.. The Trust also suggests the following policy relating to their operations: Planning permission will be granted for hospital and related development, including extensions within the grounds of North Tyneside General Hospital as defined on the proposals map where proposals do not adversely impact upon the amenity of nearby residents. Development will be expected to minimise additional traffic through travel planning and demonstrate a good standard of design.	
685112	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Sport England	LPCD2909	0	In our comments on the Plan's evidence base for sport we raised the issue of the lack of a built sports facilities strategy. This is not just an 'in principle' issue. Section 10 of the Plan deals with Infrastructure needed to support the level of development proposed, and is for the most part dominated by hard infrastructure requirements such as new roads and drainage. Sports facilities are mentioned policy S/10.13 Community Infrastructure, but the policy does little more than protect the status quo.	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure
805850	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	NHS Property Services	LPCD4189	In part	As the freeholder of site 63 (Tynemouth Victoria Jubilee Infirmary, Hawkey's Lane, North Shields), NHS Property Services would like to register our concern with the proposed policy S/10.13 Community Infrastructure. The policy states, 'Where land or buildings used as community facilities are deemed surplus to requirements, priority should be given to alternative community uses. The Council will resist losses unless: a. No short term fall in provision will be created; b. Adequate alternative facilities are already available in the area; c. Replacement facilities that meets the needs of the local population are provided; d. Land and buildings have been marketed for a 6 week period (including to local voluntary and community groups).' We do not think it is necessary to satisfy all of criteria a, b and c in order for a former healthcare site to be converted into a development of a different use. Instead we propose that if the conditions described in either a, b or c are present in relation to a healthcare facility which has been deemed surplus to requirements, the Council should not resist the conversion of a site into a different use. For example, we deem it unnecessary to provide 'replacement facilities' (c), if there are pre-existing 'alternative facilities' (b) and there is no 'short-term fall in provision' (c).	S/10.13 Community Infrastructure
396417	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	The Theatres	LPCD2677	In part	We support the document for Policy S/10.13 Community Infrastructure although we suggest the policy could be made more robust for sustainability in its	S/10.13 Community



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
		Trust			protection of existing facilities. The wording is very general and could apply to any local authority area. We suggest the first sentence of the policy is strengthened by stating that: The council will protect existing community infrastructure by resisting their loss or change of use unless replacement facilities are provided on site or within the vicinity which meets the need of neighbourhoods, or necessary services can be delivered from other facilities without leading to, or increasing, any shortfall in provision, and it has been demonstrated that there is no demand for another similar use on site. The policy would then provide criteria for protection, loss and replacements. Paragraph 10.58 gives examples of cultural and arts facilities, but does not include examples given in the bullet points of paras. 5.6 and 6.6. We strongly suggest for clarity and to obviate the need to list endless examples that the following all-inclusive description for the term "community infrastructure" is used; infrastructure for community facilities that provides for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.	Infrastructure
396269	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	English Heritage	LPCD6193	In part	Policy AS/10.14 - policy should make overt reference to avoiding impacts upon the "historic" environment.	DM/10.14 Telecommunications - Broadband, mobile phone masts and equipment
808880	ORGANISATION	Mobile Operators Association	LPCD5991	In part	While we support the inclusion of Section 10 relating to Infrastructure, including telecommunications developments, we would suggest the following amendments: Criterion (a) of Policy DM10.14 requires that there is a justifiable need for telecommunications developments 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 (a) of the Draft Policy in Section 3.8 is deleted. Criterion (b) of Policy DM10.14 states that applications will be permitted where there are no satisfactory alternative options available. In certain instances it is possible for more than one satisfactory option for the installation of telecommunications equipment to be available and a choice is made between	DM/10.14 Telecommunications - Broadband, mobile phone masts and equipment

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>the options available. In order to clarify this criterion we would suggest that the wording is amended as follows: "There are no more satisfactory alternative sites for telecommunications available."</p> <p>Criterion (e) of Policy DM10.14 states that telecommunications equipment should have no adverse impact on biodiversity. The wording of this criterion is considered to be overly restrictive on telecommunications development. In accordance with NPPF, the Mobile Network Operators aim to keep the environmental impact of communications infrastructure to a minimum. In some instances however, the provision of a high quality electronic communications network, in line with national policy, may result in some minor impact on biodiversity. In order to ensure that the policy is consistent with NPPF, we would also suggest a minor addition to the wording of criterion (e) as follows: "The development is sited and designed to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and has no unacceptable adverse impacts on biodiversity."</p>	
805832	BUSINESS	Brightblue Studio Ltd	LPCD4190	0	<p>These sites should be reduced in number before there can be more meaningful consultation. Several people who have viewed the plan have recoiled in horror that all the pink are development sites. A further consultation should be had once there are a reduced number of sites so people with limited time and resources can focus their efforts on those sites that are real possibilities. The sites at that stage should still be 'potential'.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
807164	BUSINESS	Northumbrian Water Ltd	LPCD4988	0	<p>We have completed a broad review of the potential development sites contained within the plan and are greatly encouraged that the vast majority of the Greenfield sites have excellent sustainable sewerage opportunities as they are located in close proximity to local watercourses. In addition many of the brownfield sites offer the opportunity to either separate out surface water from the combined sewerage system or to reduce run-off as part of the development proposals. This will not only help to reduce the risk of sewer flooding but will also reduce the volume of surface water draining to Howdon STW.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
396261	DEVELOPER	Places for People	LPCD4647	0	<p>Smiths Dock, North Shields On 24th April 2013, NTC issued the Decision Notice to PpP granting planning permission ref 11/02390/OUT for the redevelopment of the 12.8 Hectares former Smith's Dock shipyard in North Shields. As NTC will be aware the outline planning permission grants permission for the following two development options: Option A: 775 residential units, hotel 4605sqm and 1400sqm of commercial development A1, A3 and B1; or Option B: 815 residential units and 1400sqm of commercial development A1, A3 and B1.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>Delivery update The outline planning permission provides sufficiently flexibility to ensure detailed development proposals can be progressed which respond to changes in context such as market conditions and emerging planning policy requirements. Since planning permission was granted in April 2013, PfP have been developing detailed proposals for the site. At present, it is expected that the first reserved matters planning application will be submitted in early 2014. It is envisaged that the first phases of development will be located at the Docks and adjacent to Brewery Bond. It is expected that detailed pre-application discussions will be undertaken with NTC in advanced of these submissions. As identified through consultation regarding the NTC 5 year housing land supply, it is expected that the first housing completions will be made in 2015. Consultation Draft Local Plan Context PfP and Fairhurst have reviewed the Consultation Draft Local Plan and wish to provide comment on specific elements of the emerging plan. However, firstly, it should be noted that Smith’s Dock site, under the adopted development plan (The North Tyneside Unitary Development Plan), is allocate for employment use. As NTC will be aware, the site is no longer suitable or viable for employment use as demonstrated as part of previous planning approvals for the site, including outline planning permission ref: 11/02390/OUT. It is obviously clear that the will not be used for employment uses in the future and that the site will not be used for employment purposes in the future and that the site will be redeveloped as part of a housing-led regeneration. Fairhurst would expect that the emerging North Tyneside Local Plan will respond to this change and facilitate the delivery of the existing outline planning permission which is the largest single site contribution to North Tyneside’s 5 year housing land supply. PfP and Fairhurst would expect that the Smith’s Dock site will be allocated for housing-led development as part of the emerging Local Plan and that the planning policies will be appropriately flexible to enable the implementation of the current, flexible outline planning permission and that the new planning policy requirements, which were not required to be provided by the outline planning permission, will not be sought when reserved matters planning applications are submitted. PfP and Fairhurst are fully aware that planning policy will change and new design requirements and criteria will be introduced. However, the principle of development, use, heights, community benefits and housing mix has already been established as part of the planning application for the site will be developed within the flexible parameters which were applied for by PfP and approved by NTC. Taking the above into account</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					comments are made in relation to the Local Plan	
396265	DEVELOPER	Persimmon Homes	LPCD6629	0	It is made clear throughout the NTLPCD that all the sites highlighted on the Policy Map are not being put forward for development. Furthermore the identified capacity of these sites for housing is 12,950 units which, as explained in the comments on policies S/7.2 and S/7.3, is not considered to be a sufficient capacity to meet the full level of housing need. As such it is recommended that the development sites be reassessed “ both through additional sites, density and yield assumptions and a comprehensive green belt review. It is not considered beneficial to provide detailed comments on a significant number of the sites identified, however below are a number of sites with relevant and appropriate comments for this stage of the Local Plan Process.	11 Potential Development Sites
789566	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Environment Agency	LPCD5366	0	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 strongly recommend that the any allocations within these flood risk areas are supported by a Flood Risk Sequential and Exception Test. In allocating sites we consider you should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change.	11 Potential Development Sites
685112	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Sport England	LPCD2911	0	The Plan proposes a significant amount of growth with some particular concentrations in certain parts of the Plan area. Without a sports facilities strategy it is impossible to know whether there are adequate sports facilities to serve both the existing and proposed population and whether the facilities are located in the right places to cope with the proposed levels of development.	11 Potential Development Sites
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6252	0	The Agency has made comments under Policies S/7.2 and 7.3 in relation to both the quantum and spatial aspirations for the period of the plan, however, it is clear that in relation to the quantum of development, work is ongoing to establish a finalised number and as such the spatial aspirations and site specific allocations are as yet not known. The Agency has previously made comment in January 2012 in relation to some broad consideration to the list of sites that were being considered by North Tyneside Council as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability process. The analysis concluded that whilst many of the sites are unlikely to have significant implications on the SRN, there are a number of sites which have the potential to have significant implications. It was highlighted that when considering the cumulative impact of all sites being proposed, specific consideration will need to be given to measures that could contribute to the mitigation of these cumulative impacts. Similar conclusions	11 Potential Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>were also drawn from comments made by the Agency in March 2012 in relation to the Preferred Option Draft of the North Tyneside Area Action Plans covering North Shields, Wallsend and the Coast. It was highlighted that collectively the sites at North Shields and the Coast were unlikely to cause a significant impact on the SRN, but that sites in Wallsend and Willington Quay had the potential to have significant implications and would require further consideration as proposals get finalised. Additionally, it was emphasised that the impacts of all the developments being promoted in the Plan needed to be considered collectively. In relation to the preceding text of Chapter 11, the Agency is generally supportive of the general criteria that have so far been used to select potential development sites, as discussed in Paragraph 11.4. In particular, the Agency is supportive of excluded sites from the Green Belt, along with selecting sites that are capable of being accessed or there is reasonable prospect that suitable access could be achieved. The criteria also seeks sites that reflect the strategic priorities to promote the A19(T) economic corridor. As highlighted in response to Policy AS/5.6 and S/10.3, the A19(T) is part of the SRN and various infrastructure upgrades are anticipated within the early part of the plan period (the second Tyne Tunnel, upgrading both the Silverlink interchange and Killingworth interchange) that are dependent on funding, amongst other factors, to be delivered. As such, whilst it remains a strategic priority, the implications of the requirement of this infrastructure will be fundamental to identifying the future development sites that are carried forward into subsequent drafts of the Plan in terms quantum and distribution. As has been highlighted in relation to a number of strategic policies, the Agency is not currently in a position to determine whether the network is fully capable of supporting the housing strategy or whether further improvements may be required. Once the quantum and distribution of future housing development has been finalised, the Agency will be able to determine what the implications are for the network and whether any additional improvements will be required. This approach is in accordance with the DfT Circular 02/2013: The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development, which states that, “capacity enhancements and infrastructure required to deliver strategic growth should be identified at the Local Plan stage, which provides the best opportunity to consider development aspirations alongside the associated strategic infrastructure needs. Enhancements should not normally be considered as fresh proposals at the planning application stage”.</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
592268	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Chan Casuals Limited	LPCD4583	0	promotion of former St. Gobain site, Neptune Road, Wallsend	11 Potential Development Sites
806138	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Nexus	LPCD4320	0	Nexus own SHLAA site 301: Land Adjacent to Benton Metro. The site measures 0.39 hectares, is previously developed land and is now available for development, a turn back facility having recently been completed meaning the area is no longer needed for operational purposes. In the circumstances Nexus ask for confirmation that the area will not be protected under Policy S/10.3. Nexus also ask that the site be allocated for development to contribute towards the Borough's development needs. Nexus would welcome the opportunity to discuss the matter with officers.	11 Potential Development Sites
473231	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	0	LPCD6381	0	Land at Camperdown north of site 22 Potential @ 30/ha x 16 ha for 480 dwellings.	11 Potential Development Sites
473231	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	0	LPCD5003	0	From the preceding lists a number of issues stand out:- Several sites have appeared in previous Tyne and Wear Private Housing Land Studies for several years without coming forward eg Annistford Farm Several sites have not come forward due to very bad ground even in a strong market so are highly unlikely to going forward eg Murton Farm Several sites have been rejected in the adopted Local Plan eg playing fields at Benton Several sites are schools and there is no Council resolution to dispose of these Several sites are aspirational as they are in a poor market eg Wallsend sites Several sites are more suited to town centre uses eg North shields sites Several sites are more suited to town centre uses eg North Shields sites Several sites have over optimistic capacities Several sites proposed to change use from employment sites which are sporadic, have existing buildings with high redevelopment costs eg.North Tyneside & Bellway Ind Ests Several sites are strategic gaps eg Killingworth Farm There is a bias towards publicly owned land eg school sites, library etc. There is no headroom to delete more appropriate sites from the Green Belt as the Sustainable Development strategy precludes this eg, Burke Burradon/Camperdown site Some employment sites are retained when they do lend themselves to residential eg Site 109 Weetslade.	11 Potential Development Sites
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD6579	0	We write on behalf of our Client, Barmoor Ltd, in order to set out representations to the above document in respect of land to the south of the A1/A19 Interchange, Seaton Burn (please see attached plan at Appendix 1). Our Client consider that their site should be removed from the Green Belt and	11 Potential Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					allocated for employment use, given the site's unique location adjacent to the A1/A19 interchange. These representations have been prepared in this context.	
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD6589	0		0 11 Potential Development Sites
807177	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Barmoor Ltd	LPCD4849	0	We write on behalf of our Client, Barmoor Ltd, in order to set out representations to the above document in respect of land to the west of Russell Square, Seaton Burn (please see attached plan at Appendix 1). Our Client consider that their site is a suitable, available and deliverable housing site, which should be taken forward as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. These representations have been prepared in this context and clearly explain why the Green Belt boundaries in the Seaton Burn area should be amended to exclude our Client's site.	11 Potential Development Sites
472456	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS		LPCD3405	0	I don;t agree with the "Retail development for comparison uses of 29,000 square metres" There are enough retail out-of- town and in- town spaces available. I don't agree with building houses in green areas that are already surrounded by houses eg site 52 + 53. I dont agree with proposing to build on 3 sports pitches and an ice rink right up against a nature reserve and meadow of conservation interest as in Site 47. I don't agree with building anything until empty properties are occupied first. Someone commented elsewhere on this document that a map of empty properties should be made available to the public.	11 Potential Development Sites
470965	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Manners	LPCD6707	0	We, therefore, respectfully request that consideration is also given to the potential for our clients eastern land holdings, as shown on the attached plan, to accommodate residential development. Residential development on this site could complement any commercial or retail development within this part of the site to support the business and employment uses now expected on the land to the west to be developed by High Bridge Properties. Furthermore, the inclusion of our clients land between the A189 and Great Lime Road has significant potential to accommodate residential accommodation particularly given the decision to identify the land to the east.	11 Potential Development Sites
470965	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Manners	LPCD6711	0	In accordance with the Council's decision to identify the land to the eastern side of the A189 as 'Potential Development Site', which includes residential, our client also wishes the Council to consider again the scope for residential accommodation on their own land in accordance with previous representations submitted.	11 Potential Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
804025	LANDOWNER / BUSINESS	Mr Watson	LPCD2623	0	<p>Fairhurst have prepared these representations on behalf of Mr Watson in relation to land adjacent to Eastfield Farm, Earsdon in response to North Tyneside Council's (NTC) publication of the North Tyneside Local Plan Consultation Draft in November 2013. Fairhurst note that these representations have been duly lodged within the timescales requested by NTC and therefore should be given appropriate consideration by the Local Planning Authority. Fairhurst have above raised concerns regarding the evidence base of the housing numbers presented in the Consultation Draft Local Plan. Fairhurst consider that the current level of evidence is not sound and would not meet the requirements of the Duty to Co-operate. Fairhurst, on behalf of Mr Watson, can confirm that the Eastfield House site is suitable, available and deliverable for housing development. Fairhurst request that the site is considered for housing development as part of the Local Plan process. Fairhurst have above identified that the site should not be retained as Green Belt and should be considered for housing development. Fairhurst have identified that the development of the land would not have an unacceptable impact on the five roles of the Green Belt and it is envisaged that the development of the site for housing can be technically and environmentally delivered. Fairhurst trust that the above comments are self-explanatory. However, should you require any further information regarding the Eastfield House site, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
809185	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	0	LPCD6536	0	<p>We would in general express concern about greenfield sites being designated for development and urge that they may be developed only as a last resort, although the vast majority of the sites named here are "brownfield" sites where new development would replace previous uses or dereliction. However, we are concerned to note that the proposed "Greenfield" development sites are considerably larger, at between, 500 and 1,000 properties range than the Brownfield sites, which are relatively small. We would stress the need for effective consultation with local communities before committing to development proposals in specific locations, specially where they concern open land or the Green Belt. We would also urge consultation with the owners of nearby sites that are likely to be affected by development. For example, Site 9 (Salters' Lane Industrial Park) has aroused considerable concerns that have already been raised by the Northumberland Wildlife Trust, Save Gosforth Wildlife and many others about the possible adverse effects of development in this area upon the Gosforth Nature Reserve, which is adjacent to this site but is</p>	11 Potential Development Sites



**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					across the border with Newcastle City Council. The legal requirement for councils to co-operate must be observed strictly in this case	
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6650	0	The Trust are seeking a number of allocations for their land interests as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An allocation as a hospital use for North Tyneside General Hospital;</li> <li>• An allocation for housing for surplus land at Ash Court, North Tyneside General Hospital and Tynemouth Court to reflect their suitability for housing;</li> <li>• An allocation for housing at Site 3 at North Tyneside General Hospital to reflect appeal permission APP/W4515/A/12/2171246; and</li> <li>• An allocation as white land for Site 4 at North Tyneside General Hospital to reflect the planning permission for a 216 space car park.</li> </ul>	11 Potential Development Sites
809932	NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ORGANISATION	Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust	LPCD6653	0	In line with the Chancellor's "Plan for Growth" and the Minister of State for Housing and Local Government's announcement on 8th June 2011 in respect of "Accelerating the Release of Public Sector Land for Development", the Department of Health has prepared a Disposal Strategy for surplus land owned by itself and the NHS Trusts for sites over 0.25 hectares which have the potential to be developed for housing. The initiative has identified two sites within North Tyneside that are surplus to the Trust's requirements and are suitable for housing. Surplus Land within the grounds of NTGH The land comprises two areas. Site 3 as delineated on the plan at Appendix 1 and is currently open grass with areas of tarmac and loose surface for staff parking. On 28 August 2012, the Trust obtained outline planning permission, at appeal, for the erection of 80 dwellings (Appeal ref:APP/W4515/A/12/2171246). A full planning application for the creation of a replacement car park of 216 spaces on separate land to the south-east of the main hospital building was also approved under the same appeal reference number and that site is delineated as site 4 at Appendix 1. The site is partly a landscaped undulating bund but also contains a vacant single storey building which will be demolished to make way for the car parking. Site 3 is therefore surplus to the Trust's requirements and as confirmed above has been fully assessed as being suitable for housing as part of the release of public sector land assessment. The Trust intends to sell the site to a developer. Housing development at the site would bring significant benefits including making the best use of surplus public sector land and generate a capital receipt from the sale of the land for reinvestment into the Trust's hospitals and job creation in construction. As confirmed by the appeal decision, site 3 is a fully deliverable site, being suitable, available and achievable. This is reflected in the site's	11 Potential Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>inclusion within the Council’s Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment (October 2013) and within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Accordingly, the Trust confirm their position that the entire site should properly be allocated for housing. It is illogical to allocate a deliverable housing site that features in the Council’s five year supply as Green Infrastructure under Policy DM8.2. The Trust presumes this has been a drafting error given the Policy seeks to resist the loss of any part of the Green Infrastructure network. Following the implementation of the planning permission for site 3, the replacement car park proposed at site 4 will then be implemented. The LPIO proposals map allocates a significant proportion of the site as Green Infrastructure which does not accord with the implementable planning permission. The Trust therefore suggest site 4 should be identified in part as North Tyneside Local Plan : Representations to Issues and Options (November 2013) 6060806v1 P5 white land and partly as Green Infrastructure to reflect the approved scheme (see plan 09026 (P) 01 G at Appendix 2). Ash Court, NTGH and Tynemouth Court, North Shields 2.20 The sites form part of the Trust’s Psychiatry of Old Age Service. Ash Court (site 2 as delineated on the plan at Appendix 1) is a 0.25ha site that currently provides assessment and treatment to people who are over 65 years of age who have mental health needs. This facility will shortly close and be relocated to Wards 19 and 20 within NTGH. To accommodate this, the Trust will be seeking planning permission in early 2014 for a small scale extension to the hospital. Similarly, at Tynemouth Court (0.50ha), the Trust care for older people suffering from dementia. The unit primarily cares for those over the age of 65 and also patients with an early onset of dementia. This unit will shortly close and also be relocated within Wards 19, 20 and 21 within the NTGH and the land will be surplus to requirements. Therefore, the Trust are seeking to consolidate their Psychiatry of Old Age Service within NTGH. Ash Court is currently identified as white land within the LPIO. However, the Trust consider Ash Court should be allocated for housing and could deliver 10- 15 units. The site is surplus to the Trust’s requirements and is a deliverable brownfield site at a sustainable location. Access could be achieved onto the internal access road that leads to the Helen McArdle Care unit rather than onto A191, Rake Lane. Given the NTGH A&amp;E facility will shortly be a walk-in facility with much reduced ambulance arrivals, the hospital activity is unlikely to impact on the residential amenity of prospective residents. Indeed, this is confirmed by the appeal decision in respect</p>	

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					<p>of the adjacent site no. 3. 2.24 Tynemouth Court is also identified as white land. However, the adjacent site (Site 63) is proposed to be allocated as housing, capable of delivering 54 units. Tynemouth Court is surplus to the Trust's requirements and it is a deliverable site that could output 15 units in the first 5 years, it would therefore be entirely logical to also allocate the site for housing. Given site 63 is in a separate ownership, it would be appropriate to deliver the sites separately but ensure connections between the two sites. Allocating these sites for housing would ensure the Council are allocating sites to promote development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 157. Similarly, allocations would provide the Trust with certainty that applications for housing would be approved without delay in accordance with paragraphs 14 of the NPPF. 2.26 It is noteworthy that both sites would comply with all of the 7 criteria of Policy DM7.4 Criteria for New Housing Development thereby demonstrating the sites would be suitable for housing development and if pursued as a windfall site, North Tyneside Local Plan : Representations to Issues and Options (November 2013) P6 6060806v1 planning permission would be granted (subject to satisfying other policies relating to design, transportation etc.) As confirmed previously, housing development at the sites would generate a capital receipt from the sale of the land for reinvestment into the Trust's £200million investment plans. 2.28 In summary, the Trust seek:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An allocation as a hospital use for North Tyneside General Hospital;</li> <li>• An allocation for housing for surplus land at Ash Court and Tynemouth Court to reflect their suitability for housing;</li> <li>• An allocation for housing at Site 3 at North Tyneside General Hospital to reflect appeal decision APP/W4515/A/12/2171246; and</li> <li>• An allocation as white land for Site 4 at North Tyneside General Hospital to reflect the planning permission for a 216 space car park.</li> </ul>	
807008	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland and Newcastle Society	LPCD4740	0	<p>All of these possible development sites must however be subject to the fresh examinations of need, brown field sites and revitalisation of existing stock, which we referred to earlier, before any green field sites are considered for unnecessary urban development.</p>	11 Potential Development Sites
396412	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	LPCD6167	0	<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</p>	11 Potential Development Sites

**BUSINESS & ORGANISATION COMMENTS – POLICIES (LPCD)**

ID	Group	Organisation	Comm_ID	Yes/No	Comment	Section
					thinking these sites are not going to be developed. 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.	
809792	OTHER / LOCAL ORGANISATION	0	LPCD6608	0	Residents have contacted us to express their sincere and serious concerns at the possibility of developing several areas of Northumberland Ward. We ask the Elected Mayor, Cabinet and Planning Officers to take these concerns into consideration when finalising the Plan.	11 Potential Development Sites
768554	GOVERNMENT AGENCY	Highways Agency	LPCD6254	0	The Agency is generally supportive of the policy and the intentions to monitor the policies of the plan annually through the Annual Monitoring Report. In such circumstances where a review of the specific site allocations or the mechanisms for financial contributions, which may be affecting the viability and delivery of policies, is required, then consultation with the Agency at the earliest opportunity would be welcomed.	S/12.1 Monitoring and Local Plan Implementation